PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

I-5 N HOV AND TRUCK LANE ENHANCEMENT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES CONSULTANT (CCSC) PS67828

1.	**Contract Number**: PS67828	
2.	**Recommended Vendor**: Hill International, Inc.	
3.	**Type of Procurement (check one):** ☐ **IFB** ☒ **RFP** ☐ **RFP–A&E** ☐ **Non-Competitive** ☐ **Modification** ☐ **Task Order**	
4.	**Procurement Dates**:	
	A. Issued : January 10, 2020	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: January 11, 2020 through January 16, 2020	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: January 16, 2020	
	D. Proposals Due: March 5, 2020	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed:	
	F. Organizational Conflict of Interest Review Completed by Ethics: July 31, 2020	
	G. Protest Period End Date: August 24, 20202	
5.	**Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded**: 132	**Proposals Received**: 5
6.	**Contract Administrator**: Robert Romanowski	**Telephone Number**: 213-922-2633
7.	**Project Manager**: Paul Sullivan	**Telephone Number**: 213-922-4958

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. PS67828 I-5 N HOV and Truck Lane Enhancement Construction Support Services Consultant (CSSC) to provide construction support services that will assist and support Metro in the performance of Metro's responsibilities managing the Construction of the upcoming I-5 N HOV and Truck Lane on behalf of Caltrans including assist and support overall project and construction management, community involvement, coordination of construction impacts with surrounding community, coordination with Metro Program Management Office including Construction Management, coordination with Caltrans, safety and security compliance oversight and loss prevention, quality management, cost and schedule management, environmental and project control oversight.

Board approval of contract awards are subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was a competitively negotiated procurement process, performed in accordance with Metro Procurement Policies and Procedures. This process required each of the Proposers' proposals and qualifications to be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP. The evaluation criteria were weighted, including the cost proposal. The Proposers were rated accordingly and the results ares shown below. The RFP was issued with a DBE goal of 18%. The contract type is a cost plus fixed fee. The Contract is for a base term of five (5) years plus two (2) one-year options.

Seven amendments were issued during the solicitation phase of the RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on January 27, 2020, extended the Proposal Due Date to February 25, 2020.

- Amendment No. 2, issued on February 11, 2020, extended the Proposal Due Date to March 3, 2020.

- Amendment No. 3, issued on February 12, 2020, corrected two required Certifications to correct template formatting errors.

- Amendment No. 4, issued on February 19, 2020, extended the Proposal Due Date one final time to March 5, 2020; deleted unnecessary clauses from the Contract template; modified and finalized the Submittal Requirements; and reinstated the CHANGES clause as a mandatory flow-down provision.

- Amendment No. 5, issued February 20, 2020, confirmed the Proposal Due Date of March 5, 2020, issued a CSSC STAFFING PLAN with a standardized level of effort (labor hours) for Proposers to use in preparing their Cost and Fee Proposal, and modified the Scope of Services to finalize the Direct Labor Categories.

- Amendment No. 6, issued February 25, 2020, deleted the requirement that Proposers demonstrate evidence of bonding capacity that had previously been added to the Submittal Requirements in Amendment No. 4.

- Amendment No. 7, issued March 2, 2020, confirmed the Proposal Due Date of March 5, 2020 and finalized the DBE requirements.

A total of five (5) proposals were received on March 5, 2020 from the following firms, listed in alphabetical order:

- AECOM
- Arcadis U.S., Inc.
- Hill International, Inc.
- North Valley Partners, Joint Venture
- PreScience Corporation

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET), consisting of staff from Metro Construction Management and Office of Transit Project Delivery, was convened and conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals received.

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

- Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team 30 percent
- Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel 20 percent
- Project Understanding and Approach 30 percent
- Cost Proposal 20 percent

The evaluation criteria were appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar procurements for professional services. Several factors were considered when developing the weightings, giving the greatest importance to Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team and Project Understanding and Approach.

The PET evaluated all five (5) written qualification proposals. On March 24, 2020, the PET held oral presentations with all five (5) Proposers. The firms were given the opportunity to present on:
Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team and Project Understanding and Approach.

The proposing firms had the opportunity to present their proposed key personnel in the context of their presentation of the two Evaluation Criteria specified above as well as respond to the PET's clarifying questions. In general, each Proposer's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP.

Of the five (5) proposals received, all five (5) were determined to be within the competitive range as defined by the determination that all five proposals are technically adequate and are responsive to the Submittal Requirements of the RFP.

Qualifications Summary of Firms within the Competitive Range in Alphabetical Order:

AECOM

- Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds the requirements in the area of the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team and also in the area of Project Understanding and Approach.

ARCADIS U.S., INC.

- Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds the requirements in the area of the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Proposal significantly exceeds the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Project Understanding an Approach.

HILL INTERNATIONAL, INC.

- Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds the requirements in the area of the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Response generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel.
- Proposal significantly exceeds the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Project Understanding an Approach.

NORTH VALLEY PARTNERS, JOINT VENTURE

- Response generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Response substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds the requirements in the area of Project Understanding and Approach.

PRESCIENCE CORPORATION

- Response generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Response lacks information in demonstrating responsiveness to the Experience and Capabilities of Key Personnel.
- Response substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds the requirements in the area of Project Understanding and Approach.

The PET evaluated and scored all five (5) proposals as follows, based on the evaluation criteria in the RFP, and assessed major strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the Proposers. The most advantageous Proposer was determined to be Hill International, Inc. The final scoring was based on evaluation of the written proposals, as supported by oral presentations, clarifications received from the Proposers, and Cost. The results of the final scores are shown below:

	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
	HILL INTERNATIONAL, INC.				
	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	87.22	30%	26.17	
	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	83.75	20%	16.75	
	Project Understanding and Approach	86.10	30%	25.83	
	Cost Proposal	98.75	20%	19.75	
	Total		**100.00%**	**88.50**	**1**

	ARCADIS U.S., INC.				
	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	86.22	30%	25.87	
	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	85.35	20%	17.07	
	Project Understanding and Approach	87.77	30%	26.33	
	Cost Proposal	79.85	20%	15.97	
	Total		**100.00%**	**85.23**	**2**
	NORTH VALLEY PARTNERS, JOINT VENTURE				
	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	82.43	30%	24.73	
	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	83.50	20%	16.70	
	Project Understanding and Approach	88.83	30%	26.65	
	Cost Proposal	81.50	20%	16.30	
	Total		**100.00%**	**84.38**	**3**
	PRESCIENCE CORPORATION				
	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	75.57	30%	22.67	
	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	66.65	20%	13.33	
	Project Understanding and Approach	87.30	30%	26.19	
	Cost Proposal	100.00	20%	20.00	
	Total		**100.00%**	**82.19**	**4**
	AECOM				
	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	90.10	30%	27.03	
	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	79.60	20%	15.92	
	Project Understanding and Approach	84.43	30%	25.33	
	Cost Proposal	55.05	20%	11.01	
	Total		**100.00%**	**79.29**	**5**

* Weighted Scores are rounded up to the nearest second decimal point.

** Cost proposals were based on the Proposer's rates for a sample level of effort. Scores shown above for the cost proposals are based on formulae in the RFP with the highest score going to the lowest cost proposal.

C. Cost/Price Analysis

Metro performed a price analysis of labor rates and comparing the five (5) proposals in the competitive range with one another as well as Metro's estimate. All Cost Proposals were based on direct labor rates, overhead cost rates, other direct costs, sub-consultant costs and fixed fee. The proposed cost rates for the recommended firm were determined to be fair and reasonable. Negotiations have not yet been finalized.

	Proposer Name	Cost Proposal Amount (1)	Metro ICE	Recommended Contract Amount (2)
1	**Prescience Corporation**	$23,595,013.93	$54,034,293	**$50,000,000**
2	**Hill International, Inc.**	$23,896,911.90		
3	**North Valley Partners, Joint Venture**	$28,950,711.54		
4	**Arcadis U.S., Inc.**	$29,544,993.37		
5	**AECOM**	$42,862,892.61		

Notes:

(1) The cost proposal amounts shown are only for the standardized level of effort based on a Staffing Plan of 121,064 labor hours of Key Personnel issued in the RFP, in order to perform price analysis for evaluation purposes only. Hourly labor rates, overhead rates, ODCs, and fixed fee will be negotiated in order to reach a final Total Contract Price that can be determined to be fair and reasonable.

(2) The amount $50,000,000 is the requested NTE for the basic term of the contract. Work will be funded annually according to an Annual Work Program.

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, Hill International, Inc. is an advisory and project construction management (PM/CM) consulting firm. Hill International, Inc. has managed similar projects for Caltrans District 7 and 8, among others.