

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

**SUSTAINABILITY ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR SOLID WASTE, RECYCLING  
AND HAZARDOUS WASTE COMPLIANCE  
CONTRACT NO. AE61890**

1.	<b>Contract Number:</b> AE61890	
2.	<b>Recommended Vendor:</b>	
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> August 5, 2019	
	<b>B. Advertised/Publicized:</b> August 5, 2019 (Vendor Portal) / August 9, 2019 (Periodicals of General Circulation)	
	<b>C. Pre-Proposal Conference:</b> August 16, 2019	
	<b>D. Proposals Due:</b> October 16, 2019	
	<b>E. Pre-Qualification Completed:</b> March 2, 2020	
	<b>F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics:</b> January 15, 2020	
	<b>G. Protest Period End Date:</b> April 20, 2020	
5.	<b>Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded:</b> 79	<b>Proposals Received:</b> 5
6.	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Diana Sogomonyan	<b>Telephone Number:</b> 213.922.7243
7.	<b>Project Manager:</b> Cris B. Liban	<b>Telephone Number:</b> 213.922.2471

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve the award of Contract No. AE61890, Sustainability Engineering Services for Solid Waste, Recycling and Hazardous Waste Compliance, to provide consulting services for a wide range of projects, as well as provide services related to compliance with sustainability and environmental policies, in support of Metro's Environmental Compliance and Sustainability Department (ECSD). Efforts would include projects that fall under the following general categories: waste management, environmental management system (EMS), and emerging sustainability related and cleantech technologies. Board approval of contract awards are subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest.

The recommended consultant will furnish all labor, materials, services, and other related items required to perform the services on a Contract Work Order basis for a project, under which specific Task Orders will be issued for specific Scopes of Services and Period of Performance.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was an Architecture Engineer (AE), qualifications based procurement process performed in accordance with Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Procurement Policies and Procedures, and California Government Code §4525-4529.5 for Architectural and Engineering

services. The contract type is a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF). The Contract is for a term of three (3) years plus 2 one-year options.

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

- Amendment No. 1, issued on September 3, 2019, with revisions clarifying Contract estimated value, Insurance Requirements, Scope of Services, SBE/DVBE/DBE Instruction to Bidders/Proposers and Forms, Submittal Requirements, Evaluation Criteria, and Required Certifications (updated footer only).
- Amendment No. 2, issued on September 17, 2019, with revisions clarifying Scope of Services, DBE Instructions to Bidders/Proposers (Federal), and Submittal Requirements, as well as amended the Letter of Invitation to extend the Proposal due date.

A total of five (5) proposals were received on October 16, 2019.

**B. Evaluation of Proposals**

The Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) was comprised of representatives from the following departments: Environmental Compliance and Sustainability, Community Relations, and Quality Assurance. and the PET conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals received.

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

Experience, Qualifications, and Capabilities of Firms on the Team and Key Personnel.....	(40%)
Effectiveness of Management Plan.....	(30%)
Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation.....	(20%)
Innovative Sustainable Solid Waste/Recycling Practices and Experience.....	(10%)

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar Architect Engineer procurements. Several factors were considered when developing the criteria weightings, giving the greatest importance to the Experience, Qualifications and Capabilities of the Firms and Key Personnel, and Effectiveness of Management Plan.

This is an AE, qualifications based procurement; therefore, price cannot be used as an evaluation factor pursuant to state and federal law.

All five (5) proposals received are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. Arcadis U.S., Inc.
2. Burns & McDonnell Engineering Co., Inc.
3. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
4. Kleinfelder, Inc.
5. Tetra Tech, Inc.

During the week(s) of October 17, 2019 thru December 20, 2019, the PET reviewed the five written qualification proposals. From December 9, 2019 through December 10, 2019, Metro held Oral Presentations with all five (5) proposing firms. The proposing firms had the opportunity to present their key personnel as well as respond to the PET's questions. In general, each proposer's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required and anticipated tasks and stressed each proposer's commitment to the success of the contract. Each proposing team was asked questions relative to each firm's previous experience performing work of a similar nature to the Scope of Services presented in the RFP. Sealed cost proposals were received at the time of oral presentations.

#### **Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:**

The evaluation performed by the PET determined Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. (Jacobs) as the most qualified firm and team to provide Sustainability Engineering Services for Solid Waste, Recycling and Hazardous Waste Compliance, as provided in the RFP Scope of Services.

What distinguished Jacobs was they demonstrated, through their written proposal and oral presentation extensive technical experience and significant expertise in each of the specialty areas identified in the Scope of Services. Jacobs demonstrated high quality of technical expertise and years of experience, along with a thorough, complete and comprehensive understanding of project goals, methods and objectives.

Jacobs proposal directly addressed Metro's sustainability goals, knowledge of Metro's work done to date, and the services required under this contract Scope of Services. In addition, Jacobs demonstrated innovative tools and processes to help Metro identify innovations. They demonstrated innovative sustainable solid waste/recycling practices and experience, and a solid understanding of resources/tools used by Metro, that substantially met the RFP minimum requirements and exceeded in some major areas.

Jacobs also identified pertinent real-world examples that are applicable to Metro and demonstrated past project experience in providing the identified professional

services. Their demonstrated applicability of strategies and techniques based on past projects, shows lessons learned, which have potential to be adopted for this contract.

Their team consists of numerous highly qualified team members with extensive experience in solid and hazardous waste, including well qualified subconsultants, which substantially met the RFP minimum requirements and exceeded in some major areas. Furthermore, Jacobs demonstrated an effective Management Plan that significantly exceeded the RFP minimum requirements.

The Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) ranked the proposals, and assessed major strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the Proposers to determine the most qualified firm. The final scoring was based on evaluation of the written proposals as supported by oral presentations and clarifications received from the Proposers. The results of the scoring and ranking are shown below:

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	<b>Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.</b>				
3	Experience, Qualifications, and Capabilities of Firms on the Team and Key Personnel	87.98	40%	35.19	
4	Effectiveness of Management Plan	85.67	30%	25.70	
5	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	89.45	20%	17.89	
6	Innovative Sustainable Solid Waste/Recycling Practices and Experience	88.80	10%	8.88	
7	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>87.66</b>	<b>1</b>
8	<b>Kleinfelder, Inc.</b>				
9	Experience, Qualifications, and Capabilities of Firms on the Team and Key Personnel	85.90	40%	34.36	
10	Effectiveness of Management Plan	83.73	30%	25.12	
11	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	75.70	20%	15.14	
12	Innovative Sustainable Solid Waste/Recycling Practices and Experience	85.00	10%	8.50	
13	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>83.12</b>	<b>2</b>
14	<b>Arcadis U.S., Inc.</b>				

<b>15</b>	Experience, Qualifications, and Capabilities of Firms on the Team and Key Personnel	81.28	40%	32.51	
<b>16</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	81.33	30%	24.40	
<b>17</b>	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	83.60	20%	16.72	
<b>18</b>	Innovative Sustainable Solid Waste/Recycling Practices and Experience	80.70	10%	8.07	
<b>19</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>81.70</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>Burns &amp; McDonnell Engineering Co., Inc.</b>				
<b>21</b>	Experience, Qualifications, and Capabilities of Firms on the Team and Key Personnel	80.22	40%	32.09	
<b>22</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	78.80	30%	23.64	
<b>23</b>	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	83.95	20%	16.79	
<b>24</b>	Innovative Sustainable Solid Waste/Recycling Practices and Experience	76.10	10%	7.61	
<b>25</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80.13</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>Tetra Tech, Inc.</b>				
<b>27</b>	Experience, Qualifications, and Capabilities of Firms on the Team and Key Personnel	82.52	40%	33.01	
<b>28</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	77.33	30%	23.20	
<b>29</b>	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	76.90	20%	15.38	
<b>30</b>	Innovative Sustainable Solid Waste/Recycling Practices and Experience	78.90	10%	7.89	
<b>31</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>79.48</b>	<b>5</b>

### **C. Cost Analysis**

The recommended total estimated cost has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon a cost analysis of labor rates, indirect rates and other direct costs completed in accordance with Metro's Procurement Policies and Procedures. Metro negotiated and established indirect cost rates and as appropriate provisional indirect (overhead) rates, plus a fixed fee factor to establish a fixed fee amount based on the total estimated cost for task orders, during the contract term to compensate the consultant.

Audits will be completed, where required, for those firms without a current applicable audit of their indirect cost rates, other factors, and exclusion of unallowable costs, in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 31. In order to prevent any unnecessary delay in contract award, provisional overhead rates have been established subject to 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.

<b>Proposer:</b>			
<b>Contract Duration</b>	<b>Proposal Amount</b>	<b>Metro ICE</b>	<b>NTE Funding Amount</b>
Base Period – 3 Years	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	\$11,047,603 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$11,047,603 <sup>(2)</sup>
Option Year 1	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	\$3,825,715 <sup>(3)</sup>	\$3,825,715 <sup>(3)</sup>
Option Year 2	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	\$3,954,885 <sup>(4)</sup>	\$3,954,885 <sup>(4)</sup>

- (1) A proposal amount was not applicable. This is a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) Task Order Contract with no definable level of effort for the Scope of Services. Hourly labor rates, overhead and fee were negotiated and determined to be fair and reasonable.
- (2) The amount \$11,047,603 is the Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) for 3-year base Period of the Contract.
- (3) The amount \$3,825,715 is the Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) for Option Year 1 Period of the Contract.
- (4) The amount \$3,954,885 is the Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) for Option Year 2 Period of the Contract.

The Sustainability Engineering Services Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) was established based on the Scope of Services developed for the Contract. The probable costs are based on the anticipated level of effort estimated for each year that will be required to perform the Scope of Services by the Consultant and sub-consultants.

**D. Background on Recommended Contractor**

Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. (Jacobs) has offices located at various locations throughout United States and abroad, with local offices located in Los Angeles, Long Beach, Riverside, Ontario, San Bernardino, Irvine, and San Diego. Jacobs has been in business for over 70 years. They work with private and public sector clients and provide professional services, including engineers, scientists, and related technical and project support personnel.

Jacobs is a leader in the consulting and engineering services involving solid waste, recycling, and hazardous waste compliance. Jacobs and their proposed team worked on various local and global projects, including various Metro projects, and have expertise and knowledge of Metro systems and facilities. They have previously provided hazardous waste engineering on the construction of the Metro Red Line to North Hollywood and Orange Line BRT, and currently provide engineering services on Metro’s Twenty-Eight by ‘28 Initiative projects, including Purple Line Phase 1, I-5 North HOV Lanes, LA River Path, West Santa Ana Branch, North San Fernando Valley BRT, and SR-57/SR-60 Interchange. Jacobs’ current Metro Programs/on-Call projects include: Program Management Support Services, Highway Program

Project Delivery Support Services, Highway Program Management & QA/QC Support Services, Regional Rail On-Call, Countywide Planning Bench, and Light Rail Vehicle Overhaul Program Support Services

Furthermore, Jacobs worked on the recycLA Program and several other major programs and projects related to solid waste, recycling, and hazardous waste, such as: Atlanta's Solid Waste Master Plan, Calgary's Solid Waste Program, Zero Waste Scotland, Portland's Metro Waste Transportation and Disposal System Analysis, Union Pacific Railroad's (UPRR's) Hazardous Waste Engineering Support Services, the SoundTransit Sustainability On-Call, and Los Angeles County's Sustainable Waste Management and Recycling Program.