



Board Report

File #: 2017-0723, File Type: Contract

Agenda Number: 19.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE NOVEMBER 15, 2017

SUBJECT: SEPULVEDA TRANSIT CORRIDOR

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to:

- A. AWARD AND EXECUTE a 20-month firm fixed price Contract No. PS4044200 to Sepulveda Mobility Partners, a joint venture between HNTB Corporation and WSP USA, Inc. (formerly Parsons Brinckerhoff) to prepare the Sepulveda Transit Feasibility Study and Technical Compendium, in the amount of \$6,537,482.39, subject to resolution of protest(s), if any; and
- B. APPROVE Contract Modification Authority (CMA) for Contract No. PS4044200 in the amount of \$980,622 to support the cost of any unforeseen issues that may arise during the course of the Contract.

ISSUE

On April 26, 2017, Metro issued a Request for Proposals (RFP No. PS40442) seeking a qualified contractor to conduct the Sepulveda Transit Feasibility Study and Technical Compendium (Study). The 20-month Study will analyze a variety of options for adding new rail transit service between the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) (see Attachment C). The results of the Study will support initiation of the environmental review process and further consideration of a Public Private Partnership (P3) delivery method.

Staff is requesting Board authorization to award the Contract.

BACKGROUND

The section of Interstate 405 (I-405) between the San Fernando Valley and LAX remains one of the nation's most congested urban freeway corridors. With more than 500,000 people moving through this section every weekday, the level of congestion shows that the demand greatly exceeds the capacity of the I-405 alone. Much of this is a result of the geography of the area and the limited number of roads and public transport options running north-south through the Santa Monica Mountains and on to LAX. In 2014, the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Improvement Project completed construction of a new northbound carpool lane between the 10 and 101 Freeways, including new on-

and off-ramps, bridges and retaining walls. However, these improvements have not resulted in the congestion relief hoped for by many commuters who travel the I-405 daily.

Previous Studies

The 2012 Sepulveda Transit Corridor Systems Planning Study evaluated the potential for additional transit and/or highway improvements beyond the scope of the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Improvement Project, ultimately identifying six preliminary concepts warranting further technical study. Several of those concepts will be considered as part of this Study.

In 2015, Metro completed the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project: Analysis of Financial Strategy report, which identified strategic financial options to consider once the scope of the transportation investment for the Sepulveda corridor was better defined. The report recommended several next steps, including the exploration of alternative project delivery methods, a need for more project definition and an approach to securing environmental approvals.

Public Private Partnership (P3)

In 2016, Metro received Unsolicited Proposals for the Sepulveda Transportation Corridor which offered different approaches for adding innovation, accelerating project delivery, and reducing cost. Metro's Office of Extraordinary Innovation (OEI) is assessing whether a P3 project delivery method could be the best approach for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project. The P3 evaluation will proceed as a separate initiative from the Study. See Attachment D for an excerpt from the presentation provided to the Board in July 2017 showing the OEI process in parallel with this Study.

Project Funding

The Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project is included in Metro's 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and accelerated by the Measure M expenditure plan approved in 2016. Funding for the Project is broken down into three phases with approximately \$9.7 billion in total funding. Phase 1, with \$260 million in funding, includes implementation of Metro ExpressLanes on the I-405 between the 10 and 101 Freeways with an opening date of Fiscal Year (FY) 2026. Phase 2, with approximately \$5.7 billion in funding, includes a fixed-guideway transit service between the San Fernando Valley and the Westwood area of Los Angeles, with an opening year of FY 2033. Phase 3, with approximately \$3.8 billion in funding, involves extending the Phase 2 project southward to LAX, with an opening year of FY 2057.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

Award of the Contract will have no adverse impact to the safety of our customers and/or employees.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The FY18 budget includes \$3,575,000 in Cost Center 4350 (Transit Corridors), Project 460305 (Sepulveda Transit Corridor). Since this is a multi-year Contract, the cost center manager and Chief Planning Officer will be responsible for budgeting funds in future years.

Impact to Budget

The source of funds in FY18 is Proposition A, Proposition C, and Transportation Development Act Administration Funds which is not eligible for bus and rail operating and capital expenditures.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could choose not to award the Contract. This is not recommended as it may delay the Measure M groundbreaking date of 2024.

NEXT STEPS


Upon Board approval, staff will execute Contract No. PS4044200 with Sepulveda Mobility Partners. Going forward, the title of this study will be the Sepulveda Transit Feasibility Study and Technical Compendium. Public outreach services will be provided through a separate contract which is scheduled to commence in parallel with this Study. See Attachment E for a preliminary milestone schedule for the Study.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A - Procurement Summary
- Attachment B - DEOD Summary
- Attachment C - Study Area Map
- Attachment D - OEI Parallel Process
- Attachment E - Preliminary Milestone Schedule

Prepared by: Peter Carter, Senior Manager (213) 922-7480
Cory Zelmer, Senior Director (213) 922-1079
David Mieger, Executive Officer (213) 922-3040
Manjeet Ranu, Senior Executive Officer (213) 418-3157

Reviewed by: Therese McMillan, Chief Planning Officer, (213) 922-7077
Debra Avila, Chief Vendor/Contract Management Officer, (213) 418-3051



Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

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.

DEOD SUMMARY

**SEPULVEDA PASS TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY AND TECHNICAL
COMPENDIUM / PS4044200**

A. Small Business Participation

The Diversity and Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) established a 27% (SBE) goal, inclusive of a 24% Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and 3% Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) goal for this solicitation. Sepulveda Mobility Partners exceeded the goal by making a 29.38% SBE and 3.07% DVBE commitment.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Small Business Goal | 24% SBE 3% DVBE | Small Business Commitment | 29.38% SBE 3.07% DVBE |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|

| | SBE Subcontractors | % Committed |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 1. | Terry A. Hayes Associates, Inc. | 2.67% |
| 2. | Dunbar Transportation Consulting LLC | 1.27% |
| 3. | Wagner Engineering & Survey, Inc. | 1.61% |
| 4. | Connectics Transportation Group, Inc. | 1.93% |
| 5. | V & A Inc. | 2.53% |
| 6. | D'Leon Consulting Engineers | 3.22% |
| 7. | Trifiletti Consulting, Inc. | 1.80% |
| 8. | BA Inc. | 2.54% |
| 9. | LENAX Construction Services, Inc. | 6.22% |
| 10. | System Metrics Group, Inc. | 1.24% |
| 11. | Translink Consulting | 1.83% |
| 12. | Geospatial Professional Solutions, Inc. | 2.52% |
| | Total Commitment | 29.38% |

| | DVBE Subcontractors | % Committed |
|----|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. | MA Engineering | 3.07% |
| | Total Commitment | 3.07% |

B. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this Contract.

C. Prevailing Wage Applicability

Prevailing Wage requirements are applicable to this project. DEOD will monitor contractors' compliance with the State of California Department of Industrial

Relations (DIR), California Labor Code, and, if federally funded, the U S Department of Labor (DOL) Davis Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA). Trades that may be covered include: surveying, potholing, field, soils and materials testing, building construction inspection, construction management and other support trades.

D. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy

Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is not applicable to this Contract.

Sepulveda Transit Corridor Study Area



Relationship Between OEI and Metro Planning

