

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

SUPPLEMENTAL ENGINEERING SERVICES – RAIL FACILITIES AND 3<sup>RD</sup> PARTY SERVICES / CONTRACT NUMBER AE36687

1.	<b>Contract Number:</b> AE36687	
2.	<b>Recommended Vendor:</b> Mott MacDonald, LLC	
3.	<b>Type of Procurement (check one):</b> <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.	<b>Procurement Dates:</b>	
	<b>A. Issued:</b> December 19, 2016	
	<b>B. Advertised/Publicized:</b> December 26, 2016	
	<b>C. Pre-proposal/Pre-Bid Conference:</b> December 28, 2016	
	<b>D. Proposals/Bids Due:</b> January 25, 2017	
	<b>E. Pre-Qualification Completed:</b> May 30, 2017	
	<b>F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics:</b> May 24, 2017	
	<b>G. Protest Period End Date:</b> May 19, 2017	
5.	<b>Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded:</b> 101	<b>Bids/Proposals Received:</b> 5
6.	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Rafael Vasquez	<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 418-3036
7.	<b>Project Manager:</b> Aspet Davidian	<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-5258

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve the award of Contract No. AE36687, issued in support of Supplemental Engineering Services – Rail Facilities and 3<sup>rd</sup> party Services (SES). The scope of the Contract is to provide Engineering and Design including Final Design of Transportation projects which include rail and highway projects. 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 is an Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity type contract using Task Orders to release unique scopes of work and compensating the Consultant, at lump sum prices to the maximum extent possible, or as necessary on a cost reimbursable fixed fee basis for costs. The Contract period of performance is three base years plus two one year options.

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

- Amendment No. 1, issued on January 12, 2017, to modify RFP requirements including General Certification Forms, Contractor Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and voluntary Exclusion Instructions.

On December 28, 2016, a pre-proposal conference was held with thirty-two (32) firms in attendance. A total of 5 proposals from the following firms were received on January 25, 2017:

1. Mott MacDonald, LLC;
2. HDR;
3. AECOM;
4. STV, Inc.; and
5. CH2M

## **B. Evaluation of Proposals/Bids**

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Engineering Management and from Major Capital Project 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:

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| • Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Team        | 30% |
| • Key Personnel's Skills and Experience                                    | 30% |
| • Effectiveness of Management Plan   | 20% |
| • Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach For Implementation | 20% |

This is an Architect and Engineering (A&E), qualifications based procurement. Price cannot be and was not used as an evaluation factor as governed by California Government Code §4525 – 4529.

The evaluation criteria were appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar A&E solicitations.

During the week of March 16, 2017, 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, the understanding of work approach, design experience 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 qualifications and previous experience.

**Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:**

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

Mott MacDonald, LLC has extensive experience with Metro “on call” contracts and have also done similar projects for other transit agencies. Their firm showed a good understanding of Metro’s processes and solutions to mitigate potential risks.

In addition to their project team, Mott MacDonald, LLC clearly demonstrated the integration of subcontractors and their Project Management Plan clearly defined communication and monitoring of subcontractors. This includes redundancy across roles to ensure availability and a high percentage of staff commitment. Mott MacDonald, LLC showed clear identification of opportunities to improve services through innovative approaches.

Mott MacDonald’s core personnel, consists of a highly qualified group of key staff and support personnel to address all tasks outlined in the Scope of Services with the ability to deploy staff to meet the needs of Metro’s Supplemental Engineering Services program. The proposal outlines how the consultant team will efficiently work collaboratively on Metro’s Supplemental Engineering Service related projects to ensure assigned tasks and projects are properly coordinated to meet the goals and objectives of Metro’s Supplemental Engineering Service program.

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

<b>1</b>	<b>Firm</b>	<b>Average Score</b>	<b>Factor Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Average Score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Mott MacDonald, LLC</b>				
<b>3</b>	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant’s Team	89.33	30.00%	26.80	
<b>4</b>	Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience	90.33	30.00%	27.10	
<b>5</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	88.67	20.00%	17.73	
<b>6</b>	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	92.00	20.00%	18.40	
<b>7</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>90.03</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>8</b>	<b>HDR</b>				
<b>9</b>	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Team	91.67	30.00%	27.50	
<b>10</b>	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	86.67	30.00%	26.00	
<b>11</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	87.00	20.00%	17.40	
<b>12</b>	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	90.67	20.00%	18.13	
<b>13</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>89.03</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>AECOM</b>				
<b>15</b>	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Team	85.33	30.00%	25.60	
<b>16</b>	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	88.67	30.00%	26.60	
<b>17</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	84..33	20.00%	16.87	
<b>18</b>	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	92.00	20.00%	18.40	
<b>19</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>87.47</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>STV</b>				
<b>21</b>	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Team	83.67	30.00%	25.10	
<b>22</b>	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	84.67	30.00%	25.40	
<b>23</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	85.33	20.00%	17.07	
<b>24</b>	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	87.67	20.00%	17.53	
<b>25</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>85.10</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>CH2M</b>				
<b>27</b>	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Team	84.67	30.00%	25.40	
<b>28</b>	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	84.67	30.00%	25.40	
<b>29</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	85.33	20.00%	17.07	
<b>30</b>	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	84.33	20.00%	16.87	
<b>31</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>84.74</b>	<b>5</b>

### **C. Cost/Price Analysis**

A cost analysis of labor rates, indirect rates and other costs was completed in accordance with Metro's Procurement Policies and Procedures to negotiate a fair and

reasonable price. The analysis includes among other things, (1) a comparison with similar firms offering the same services; (2) an analysis of audited rates and factors for labor, equipment and other prices that will comprise the rates upon which the Consultant will base its invoices, and (3) compliance with both the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) guidelines and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). Metro negotiated and established direct labor rates plus provisional indirect rates and a fixed fee rate. The pricing for each task order will utilize the rates, plus the negotiated fixed fee factor, to establish a lump sum price or a not-to-exceed cost reimbursable amount plus a fixed fee.

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 will be 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.

#### **D. Background on Recommended Contractor**

The recommended firm, Mott MacDonald, was founded in 1902 as (Mott & Hay) and in 1996, Mott MacDonald and the Canadian company Hatch created a joint venture called Hatch Mott MacDonald in North America. In 2016, Hatch Mott MacDonald was divided into two separate businesses. Mott MacDonald pursues projects in the U.S., Canada and around the world. Mott MacDonald specializes in rail transit, tunnels, transportation and highways.