PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

CEQA/NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES AND SUPPORT / PS20111

1.	Contract Number: PS20111			
2.	Recommended Vendor: ICF International			
3.	Type of Procurement (check one): ☐ IFB ☐ RFP ☒ RFP-A&E			
	☐ Non-Competitive ☐ Modification ☐ Task Order			
4.	Procurement Dates:			
	A. Issued : January 29, 2016			
	B. Advertised/Publicized: February 9, 2016			
	C. Pre-proposal/Pre-Bid Conference: February 18, 2016			
	D. Proposals/Bids Due: March 14, 2016			
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: November 2, 2016			
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: June 3, 2016			
	G. Protest Period End Date: 1/2017			
5.	Solicitations Picked	Bids/Proposals Received: 5		
	up/Downloaded: 81			
6.	Contract Administrator:			
	Tamara Reid (213) 922-7215			
7.	Project Manager:	Telephone Number:		
	Emmanuel Liban	(213) 922-2471		

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. PS20111, issued in support of CEQA/NEPA environmental services and support. The scope of the Contract is to support the preparation of studies, surveys, investigations, modeling, predications, data analyses and reporting related to the categories of impact found in the CEQA/NEPA guidelines or as required by conditions identified during the planning, development, and design stages of a project and/or during the construction, operation or close-out phases of a project. Board approval of contract awards are subject to resolution of all properly submitted protests.

The RFP was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and California Government Code §4525-4529. The contract type is a five-year cost-plus fixed fee contract, inclusive of two one-year options.

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

• Amendment No. 1, issued on March 9, 2016 to modify RFP documents.

On February 18, 2016, a pre-proposal conference was held with 30 firms in attendance. A total of five proposals from the following firms were received on March 14, 2016:

- 1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM)
- 2. CH2M Hill

- 3. ICF International (ICF)
- 4. Sapphos Environmental Inc. (Sapphos)
- 5. Ultrasystems

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Environmental Compliance and Transportation Planning was convened and conducted a comprehensive technical evaluation of the proposal received.

The proposal was evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria and weights:

•	Proposed Team Capabilities and Experience	26%
•	Role and Relevant Experience and Capability	25%
	of the Firms on the Prime Contractor's Team	
•	Staff Positions Identified in the Scope of Services	25%
•	Project Management Approach	20%
•	DBE Contracting Outreach and Mentor Protégé	4%
	Approach	

This is an Architecture and Engineering (A&E), qualifications based procurement. Price cannot be used as an evaluation factor as governed by California Government Code §4525 - 4529. The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar A&E solicitations.

During the week of April 18, 2016, the evaluation committee conducted oral presentations with 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.

Qualification Summary of Recommended Firm:

The evaluation performed by the PET, in accordance with evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP, determined ICF as the most qualified firm to provide the required services.

ICF has provided relevant environmental planning and regulatory compliance experience working on Metro projects such as the Blue Line, Green Line, Orange Line, Red Line, and Gold Line and their extensions; the Wilshire BRT project; Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor; Exposition Line Phase I; and projects along the I-5, I-710, I-405, SR 2, SR 57, SR 60, and SR 210 freeways. ICF provided a detailed Project Management Plan that included extensive coordination with internal teams

and Metro as well as staffing requirements demonstrated a clear understanding of the proposed scope of work.

ICF demonstrated they are well-skilled in providing the scope of services at the level required by this contract, and has the capabilities to provide staffing for task order assignments that may be issued under this contract.

The PET ranked the proposals and assessed strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the Proposers to determine the most qualified firm.

1	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	ICF				
3	Proposer's team capabilities and experience	92.65	26%	24.09	
4	Role and relevant experience and capability of the firms on the prime contractor's team	90.00	25%	22.50	
5	Staff positions identified in the scope of services	95.32	25%	23.83	
6	Project management approach	90.65	20%	18.13	
7	DBE Contracting Outreach & Mentor Protégé Approach	100.00	4%	4.00	
8	Total		100%	92.55	1
9	AECOM				
10	Proposer's team capabilities and experience	86.35	26%	22.45	
11	Role and relevant experience and capability of the firms on the prime contractor's team	86.32	25%	21.58	
12	Staff positions identified in the scope of services	88.68	25%	22.17	
13	Project management approach	83.00	20%	16.60	
14	DBE Contracting Outreach & Mentor Protégé Approach	100.00	4%	4.00	
15	Total		100%	86.80	2

16	Sapphos				
17	Proposer's team capabilities	91.00	26%	23.66	

	and experience				
	Role and relevant experience				
	and capability of the firms on				
18	the prime contractor's team	87.68	25%	21.92	
	Staff positions identified in				
19	the scope of services	87.32	25%	21.83	
	Project management				
20	approach	88.35	20%	17.67	
	DBE Contracting Outreach &	05.00	407	4.00	
21	Mentor Protégé Approach	25.00	4%	1.00	
22	Total		100%	86.08	3
23	Ultrasystems				
	Proposer's team capabilities				
24	and experience	80.65	26%	20.97	
	Role and relevant experience				
	and capability of the firms on		0=0/	00.50	
25	the prime contractor's team	82.00	25%	20.50	
	Staff positions identified in	00.00	050/	04.50	
26	the scope of services	86.00	25%	21.50	
27	Project management approach	83.35	20%	16.67	
21	DBE Contracting Outreach &	03.33	20 /0	10.07	
28	Mentor Protégé Approach	75.00	4%	3.00	
	9	70.00			4
29	Total		100%	82.64	4
30	CH2MHill				
	Proposer's team capabilities	70.00	000/	40.00	
31	and experience	70.00	26%	18.20	
	Role and relevant experience				
22	and capability of the firms on	64.00	250/	46.00	
32	the prime contractor's team	64.32	25%	16.08	
33	Staff positions identified in the scope of services	80.00	25%	20.00	
33	Project management	00.00	25%	20.00	
34	approach	81.65	20%	16.33	
 3 -	DBE Contracting Outreach &	01.00	2070	10.00	
35	Mentor Protégé Approach	75.00	4%	3.00	
36	Total		100%	73.61	5
	. 0.01		1.0070	. 0.01	
			Ì	Ì	

C. Cost/Price Analysis

The cost analysis included: (1) a comparison with historical cost data of other firms offering similar services; (2) an analysis of prior audited and overhead rates, and factors for labor, and other direct costs, and (3) compliance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 31 guidelines. Metro has rates for direct labor and provisional overhead rates, and a negotiated fixed fee rate for the contract. The negotiated amount has been determined to be fair and reasonable.

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.

Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Funding Amount
ICF International	\$26,000,000	\$25,604,000	\$25,604,000

Note: This is a a five-year cost-plus fixed fee Contract inclusive of two one-year options with an initial amount not-to-exceed \$25,604,000, inclusive of three base years (not to exceed \$15,076,003) with two one-year options (year one = \$5,211,497 and year two = \$5,315,727).

D. <u>Background on Recommended Contractor</u>

ICF was founded in 1969. ICF is a multidisciplinary firm providing professional services in environmental planning and regulatory compliance. ICF provides the full range of environmental documentation for transportation projects and Categorical Exclusions under NEPA and Categorical Exemptions under CEQA.

ICF has a successful partnership with Metro that dates back to 1980, and has had a role helping to deliver some of Metro's largest projects, including the Blue Line, Green Line, Orange Line, Red Line, and Gold Line and their extensions; the Wilshire BRT project; Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor; Exposition Line Phase I; and projects along the I-5, I-710, I-405, SR 2, SR 57, SR 60, and SR 210 freeways in Los Angeles.