

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM ASSISTANCE SERVICES/PS84203243

1.	Contract Number: PS84203243	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Cumming Construction Management, Inc.	
3.	Type of Procurement (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> IFB <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFP <input type="checkbox"/> RFP-A&E <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Competitive <input type="checkbox"/> Modification <input type="checkbox"/> Task Order	
4.	Procurement Dates:	
	A. Issued: 09/09/2014	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: 09/20/14	
	C. Pre-proposal/Pre-Bid Conference: 10/01/2014	
	D. Proposals/Bids Due: 11/21/2014	
	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: 143	Bids/Proposals Received: 3
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. PS84203243 issued in support of Sustainability Program Assistance Services.

The RFP was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract will issue contract work orders on a Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee basis based on the Scope of Work and level of effort for each project participating in the services of this contract.

One (1) amendment was issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on October 21, 2014 revised the Due Date, the Submittal Requirements, and Form V1.0.

Metro held a pre-proposal conference on October 1, 2014, in the Gateway Conference Room on the 3rd floor of the Gateway Building. There were thirty-five (35) representatives from twenty-seven (27) firms that signed in at the pre-proposal conference. One-hundred forty three (143) individuals from various firms picked up the RFP Package. There one (1) amendment issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP. The firms that picked up or downloaded the RFP asked a total of forty-seven (47) Questions.

Metro received three (3) proposals on the due date November 21, 2014.

B. Evaluation of Proposals/Bids

The Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisted of two (2) members from Metro’s Environmental Department and one (1) member from Metro’s Planning Department, with good working knowledge of the contract requirements and technical capabilities to evaluate the proposals fairly without prejudice. The PET evaluated each firm and its proposed team of subcontractors, in accordance with the following Evaluation Criteria set forth in the RFP documents, and performance requirements included in the scope of services, utilizing the scoring guidelines shown in the table below.

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

- Price 30 percent
- Degree of Skills and Experience of Personnel on Team 25 percent
- Experience of Firms on Team 20 percent
- Project management approach 15 percent
- Effectiveness of Management Plan and Quality 10 Percent

The evaluation criteria are appropriate 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.

The solicitation was a competitively negotiated (non-A&E) procurement with price as a factor, as governed by the Metro ACQ-2 and FTA Circular 4220.1f. Price and technical factors were considered in the overall scoring of the proposals and award is based on the Proposal deemed in Metro’s best interests, followed by negotiations with the selected firm.

Metro received three (3) proposals on the due date of November 21, 2014, from the following firms:

1. CDM Smith, Inc. (CDM Smith)
2. Cumming Construction Management, Inc. (Cumming)
3. Urban Collaborative Studios, LLC. (UCS)

During the week of December 15, 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:

The Cumming team exhibited a clear and thorough understanding of the project and approach, as evidenced by their proposal and oral interview. Both their written proposal and oral answers described a programmatic approach to the Scope of Services that seemed to align well with Metro’s sustainability goals, policies, and practices. The approach demonstrated deep understanding of each section of the scope and addressed each item individually, along with best practices on how to execute each item. Additionally, Cumming’s presentation also addressed both near and long term issues they expect to encounter.

1	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	Cumming				
3	Price		30.00%	28	
4	Degree of Skills and Experience of Personnel on Team		25.00%	23	
5	Experience of Firms on Team		20.00%	18	
6	Project Understanding and Approach		15.00%	14	
7	Effectiveness of Management Plan and Quality		10.00%	9	
8	Total		100.00%	92	1

9	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
10	CDM Smith				
11	Price		30.00%	19	
12	Degree of Skills and Experience of Personnel on Team		25.00%	18	
13	Experience of Firms on Team		20.00%	15	
14	Project Understanding and Approach		15.00%	12	
15	Effectiveness of Management Plan and Quality		10.00%	9	
16	Total		100.00%	73	2

17	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
18	UCS				
19	Price		30.00%	30	
20	Degree of Skills and Experience of Personnel on Team		25.00%	10	
21	Experience of Firms on Team		20.00%	9	
22	Project Understanding and Approach		15.00%	5	
23	Effectiveness of Management Plan and Quality		10.00%	5	
24	Total		100.00%	59	3

C. Cost/Price Analysis

The cost analysis included (1) a comparison with historical data of other firms offering similar services; (2) an analysis of audited 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, terms and conditions, level of effort, 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 negotiated labor rates plus the provisional overhead rate and negotiated fee factor to establish a not-to-exceed amount on a cost-plus-fixed fee 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 rates have been established subject to retroactive adjustments upon completion of any necessary audits. 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 Contract Work Orders will be determined based upon a cost analysis, technical evaluation, fact finding, and negotiations, before issuing work to the Consultant.

The total evaluated contract prices are listed below.

	Bidder/Proposer Name	Proposal Amount for Evaluation	Negotiated
1.	Cumming	\$12,823,943	\$12,481,230

	Bidder/Proposer Name	Proposal Amount for Evaluation	Negotiated
2.	CDM Smith	\$19,007,825	\$19,007,825

	Bidder/Proposer Name	Proposal Amount for Evaluation	Negotiated
3.	UCS	\$5,096,122	\$11,830,629

UCS submitted an updated cost proposal that increased their proposal amount from \$5,096,122 to \$11,830,629 as part of their Best and Final Offer because the proposer chose to address clarifications in the scope of services and anticipated level of effort.

The evaluated prices were scored based on the following formula:

Proposer Cost Score = Lowest Cost Proposal / Proposer's Cost * 30 (maximum score)

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

Cumming is an international company that provides consultancy services in a wide variety of fields, including environmental, sustainability, and support services. Since opening for business nearly two decades ago, Cumming has grown consistently and substantially. Today, they have nearly 350 team members and have completed projects in more than 25 countries around the world.

The recommended contractor also has experience working in the Los Angeles area with public agencies to provide environmental project management services similar to the scope of services required under this contract. Cumming offers support and management services necessary to address Metro's expanding sustainable capital building programs, including construction support, environmental and sustainability policy development and implementation, energy conservation and renewable energy management, environmental management systems, and climate change and greenhouse gas emissions management.

E. Small Business Participation

The Diversity and Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) established a 25% Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal for this solicitation. Cumming

Construction Management, Inc. exceeded the goal by making a 43.83% RC DBE and 6.19% RN DBE commitments.

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goal	25% DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Commitment	43.83% RC DBE 6.19% RN DBE
---	----------------	---	---------------------------------------

	DBE Subcontractors	Ethnicity	% Commitment
1.	ICI Engineers	Asian Pacific American	2.92%
2.	C2PM	Asian Pacific American	4.87%
3.	Paragon	Asian Pacific American	9.90%
4.	GC Green	Hispanic American	4.99%
5.	Century Diversified, Inc.	Hispanic American	1.64%
6.	W2Design	Asian Pacific American	5.95%
7.	The Solis Group	Hispanic American	3.04%
8.	Power-Tech Engineers	Hispanic American	10.51%
	Total RC DBE Commitment		43.83%
9.	Coto Consulting, Inc.	Non-Minority Women	4.24%
10.	Integrated Engineering Mgmt.	Non-Minority Women	1.95%
	Total RN DBE Commitment		6.19%

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.	Century Diversified	Engineering and CADD services
2.	W2Design	Engineering and GIS expertise
3.	Coto Consulting	Certified ISO14001 and EMS consulting
4.	ICI Engineers	Energy engineering
5.	C2PM	EMS and Project Management
6.	Paragon	EMS and Project Management
7.	GC Green	Energy engineering
8.	Okapi Architecture	Energy & Sustainability planning
9.	The Solis Group	Project management
10.	Integrated Engineering Management	Engineering
11.	Empowered Solutions	Energy engineering and renewable energy

12.	Power-Tech Engineers	Energy engineering
13.	Eckersall	GIS Services
14.	Evans Brooks Associates	Sustainability policy and planning
15.	Lentini Design	Graphic design and marketing