

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

SEPULVEDA PASS TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY AND TECHNICAL
COMPENDIUM /PS4044200

1.	Contract Number: PS4044200	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Sepulveda Mobility Partners (Joint Venture (JV) of HNTB Corporation and WSP USA, 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: April 26, 2017	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: April 24, 2017	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: May 16, 2017	
	D. Proposals Due: August 14, 2017	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: October 30, 2017	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: August 14, 2017	
	G. Protest Period End Date: November 17, 2017	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 119	Bids/Proposals Received: 4
6.	Contract Administrator: Lily Lopez	Telephone Number: (213) 922-4639
7.	Project Manager: Cory Zelmer	Telephone Number: (213) 922-1079

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. PS4044200 issued in support of the Transit Feasibility Study and Technical Compendium (Study) for the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor. The intent of the Study is to clarify the design features and overall feasibility of potential fixed guideway transit solutions, based on new information gathered about the corridor environment and integration with existing or planned Metro facilities. Board approval of contract awards are subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type is firm fixed price.

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

- Amendment No. 1, issued on May 23, 2017, provided revised documents related to the Scope of Services;
- Amendment No. 2, issued on June 8, 2017, extended the proposal due date;
- Amendment No. 3, issued on July 7, 2017, provided revised documents related to the Scope of Services, Evaluation Criteria and List of Certified SBE Firms as a result of the expanded study area.

A pre-proposal conference was held on May 16, 2017, and was attended by 53 participants representing 30 firms. During the solicitation phase, 44 questions were asked and responses were released prior to the proposal due date.

A total of 119 firms downloaded the RFP and were included in the planholders list. A total of four proposals were received on August 14, 2017 from the following firms:

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM)
2. Hatch Associates Consultant, Inc. (Hatch)
3. HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR)
4. Sepulveda Mobility Partners (SMP)

AECOM voluntarily withdrew its proposal.

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro's Countywide Planning, Construction, Program Management/Delivery, Office of Extraordinary Innovation, and Operations was convened and conducted a comprehensive technical evaluation of the proposals received.

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

- | | |
|---|------------|
| • Degree of Skills and Experience of Team | 15 percent |
| • Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team | 15 percent |
| • Effectiveness of Team Management Plan | 15 percent |
| • Understanding of Work and Approach for Implementation | 35 percent |
| • Cost Proposal | 20 percent |

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other similar feasibility study procurements. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the understanding of work and approach for implementation. The PET evaluated the proposals according to the pre-established evaluation criteria.

During the week of September 4, 2017, the PET completed its independent evaluation of the three proposals and determined that all of the firms were deemed within the competitive range. The three firms within the competitive range are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. Hatch
2. HDR
3. SMP

After initial evaluations, the PET determined that oral presentations by the firms within the competitive range were required. During the week of September 11, 2017, the firms conducted their oral presentations. The firms' project managers and key team members had an opportunity to present each team's qualifications and respond to the PET's questions. In general, each team addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required scope, and stressed each firm's commitment to the success of the project. Each team was asked questions relative to each firm's proposed staffing plans, perceived challenges associated with the project, identification of potential risks within the study area, approach for successfully delivering the project and previous experience.

Fact finding meetings were held with all three firms to ensure that the assumptions included in the cost proposal accurately reflected the intent and expectations of what the work required along the entire corridor. All firms were provided an opportunity to clarify any assumptions that were not accurately reflected in their initial cost proposal.

Qualifications Summary of Firms within the Competitive Range:

SMP

SMP JV team demonstrated successful delivery of projects similar to the Sepulveda Pass Corridor for Metro such as the Purple Line Extension (PLE), the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor, Expo Phase 2, and the Regional Connector. The team has demonstrated expertise in planning, ridership forecasting, tunneling, and guideway design with designing aerial, at-grade and tunnel alignments/stations for light rail transit (LRT) and heavy rail transit (HRT), and monorail at Newark Airport. Their experience with the West Santa Ana Branch connection to Union Station and Airport Metro Connector involved station to station experience and pedestrian circulation. Expo II and PLE involve terminal design with high-capacity operations.

SMP's management approach and understanding of work was well developed. For management, the SMP team provided a more detailed approach to engaging key Metro Department's and staff at specific milestones during the study. The team acknowledged that an iterative approach would be necessary to vet new ideas and concepts, but that to maintain the schedule, they would need to progress multiple tasks simultaneously. Lastly, the team understood the need to evaluate the northern and southern portions of the study area in a sequential manner starting with the north section.

Hatch

The Hatch team demonstrated LRT and tunneling experience, including Regional Connector tunnel design, maintenance facility, and transit connection study to the airport in Vancouver. The proposal demonstrated limited experience in the areas of modeling, risk analysis and fixed guideway planning for LRT and HRT modes. Thus, the proposal lacked a sound understanding of the project area as various themes

outlined in the Scope of Services were repeated in the proposal without concrete evidence of how they would be delivered. Availability of key staff was a concern as their proposed key staff members (inclusive of the Project Manager (PM) and Deputy PM) have other ongoing project commitments. The proposed approach was high-level and required Metro to monitor and identify action items throughout the process.

The proposed PM has over 15 years of experience in civil engineering design and construction management and is the concept design lead, but did not demonstrate extensive experience with fixed guideway transit design, with exception of High Speed Rail project. To augment the experience of the PM, a Project Sponsor was proposed to provide oversight and guidance.

HDR

The HDR team demonstrated experience in completing similar projects that involve fixed guideway transit. The design lead has primarily streetcar projects as relevant experience. Some of the proposed process diagrams under the planning component, did not yield much detail on designing and analyzing the concepts or how future phasing would be addressed. During the oral presentations, the firm's proposed accelerated schedule did not clarify how task overlap would be addressed. The proposed approach was high-level and required Metro to monitor and identify action items throughout the process.

The proposed PM has nearly two decades of local experience in planning, design and analysis of transportation infrastructure projects, but no extensive experience leading similar projects involving fixed guideway transit was demonstrated. To augment the experience of the PM, a Project Sponsor was proposed to provide oversight and guidance.

Following is a summary of the PET scores:

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	SMP				
3	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	87.53	15.00%	13.13	
4	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team	88.33	15.00%	13.25	
5	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	84.00	15.00%	12.60	
6	Understanding of Work and Approach for Implementation	87.80	35.00%	30.73	
7	Cost Proposal	82.75	20.00%	16.55	
8	Total		100.00%	86.26	1
9	HDR				
10	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	83.80	15.00%	12.57	
11	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team	81.53	15.00%	12.23	
12	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	80.53	15.00%	12.08	
13	Understanding of Work and Approach for Implementation	74.20	35.00%	25.97	
14	Cost Proposal	100.00	20.00%	20.00	
15	Total		100.00%	82.85	2
16	Hatch				
17	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	85.27	15.00%	12.79	
18	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team	77.87	15.00%	11.68	
19	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	82.27	15.00%	12.34	
20	Understanding of Work and Approach for Implementation	78.60	35.00%	27.51	
21	Cost Proposal	89.35	20.00%	17.87	
22	Total		100.00%	82.19	3

C. Cost Analysis

The recommended price has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon previous MAS audit findings, an independent cost estimate, cost analysis, technical analysis, fact finding, and negotiations.

Based on fact finding discussions held with all three firms, both Hatch and HDR confirmed that their initial cost proposal captured all the requirements and

assumptions of the project; thus, their respective cost proposal remained unchanged. SMP adjusted its cost proposal based on Metro’s clarifications for key tasks that will involve two distinct phases of work, and potentially deliverables, to address the Phase 2 and Phase 3 projects identified in the Measure M expenditure plan.

	Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Negotiated
1.	SMP	\$6,041,239.81	\$10,151,807	\$6,537,482
2.	Hatch	\$5,595,993.65	\$10,151,807	N/A
3.	HDR	\$4,999,982.00	\$10,151,807	N/A

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, SMP, a Joint Venture (JV) of HNTB Corporation and WSP USA Inc., is located in Los Angeles and collectively have been in business for 235 years (103 years for HNTB and 132 years for WSP). The JV offers cross-disciplinary services across various sectors including transportation and infrastructure, engineering, and construction management.

The team is based in downtown Los Angeles with over 30 years of Metro transit planning experience, including the expertise from the I-405 widening project, the PLE, and the Westside Mobility Study. Furthermore, the proposed PM has over 40 years of industry experience managing rail transit projects from planning through construction, most recently in Los Angeles, San Diego, and Houston. The PM has expertise in major transit planning, various modes of LRT, HRT, Bus Rapid Transit, alternative modes, monorail, and environmental clearance. Also, other key members have experience in feasibility studies and alternatives analysis of transit and highway corridors throughout Southern California, including the ridership forecasting and financial analysis task of the 2012 Sepulveda Pass Corridor Systems Planning Study, the SR-710 North Study Alternative Analysis and the ridership forecasts, transit and highway design, and alignment studies, preliminary engineering, and final design.

HNTB and WSP have worked on several Metro projects and have performed satisfactorily.

The proposed team is comprised of staff from SMP and 17 subcontractors, of which 12 are Metro certified SBEs and one is DVBE certified.