

Board Report

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

Agenda Number: 40.

REGULAR BOARD MEETING JUNE 22, 2023

SUBJECT: LINK UNION STATION PROJECT

File #: 2023-0325, File Type: Budget

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZE The Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. NEGOTIATE, AWARD AND EXECUTE a cost reimbursable fixed fee Contract No. AE83177E0130, to Lockwood, Andrews, & Newman, Inc (LAN), for preconstruction services and construction management support services on the Link US Project, subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest(s);
- B. AUTHORIZE a contract funding amount not-to-exceed \$16,250,000 through January 2027 to support preconstruction services with an anticipated Annual Work Plan not to exceed \$3,500,000; and
- C. NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE contract modifications within the Board approved contract funding amount.

ISSUE

Staff is seeking the Board to award a cost reimbursable fixed fee Construction Management Support Services Contract (CMSSC) to LAN for the Link US Project. Construction management support services will be needed to support advanced preliminary engineering, final design, pre-construction activities with the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) contractor, third party construction, early work construction, main construction, administration of construction contracts, and contract close-out during the delivery of the Link US Project.

The CMSSC will provide Metro the flexibility to adjust the necessary resources with staff augmentation on an as-needed basis to deliver the Link US Project safely, on time, and within budget.

BACKGROUND

The Link US Project will transform how the commuter and intercity rail operates in Southern California with run-through capability at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) providing one-seat rides from San Luis Obispo to San Diego, increasing commuter and intercity rail services by up to 60%, and accommodating future high-speed rail service. The Link US Project is planned to be implemented in two phases:

- 1. Phase A would include construction of the full viaduct structure over the US-101 freeway that accommodates up to nine (9) new run-through tracks, track, signal, and communication work in the throat area, run-through platform, quiet zone ready improvements at Main Street grade crossing, active transportation improvements and some preliminary engineering design for Phase B. Phase A improvements have received funding commitments of \$950.398 million.
- 2. <u>Phase B</u> would include raising the rail yard up to 15 feet for the run-through track viaduct structure, new platforms, a newly expanded passageway, and access to all platforms that comply with current ADA standards, and a new lead track north of the railyard. Phase B is funded for planning, environmental, and some preliminary engineering, but it is not fully funded for final design and construction.

Metro's construction management support services' philosophy envisions that the primary role of the CMSSC is to provide highly skilled and qualified individuals to assist and support Metro in the construction management and administration of construction projects. This role also entails ensuring that the construction of projects is completed with a high level of quality and safety. The CMSSC staff are fully integrated into the construction project team with Metro staff. CMSSC staff have the specialized technical and administrative expertise to assist and support project delivery and implementation and to perform the necessary project reporting requirements and control procedures established by Metro. In the performance of work, CMSSC staff must adhere to and comply with all Metro policies and procedures.

The CMSSC proposed herein are mainly to assist in the delivery of Link US Phase A; however, the CMSSC may be used to support any preliminary engineering construction management support for Link US Phase B. Optional scope is available for final design and construction of Link US Phase B, within the term of the contract, provided funding is available.

CEQA & NEPA

Under a separate funding agreement with California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), in 2017 LACMTA received American Recovery and Reinvestment Act federal funds for environmental and planning work for the Link US Project. The Link US Project completed California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental clearance in July 2019 and a CEQA amendment was approved in October 2021. Furthermore, the Link US Project is in the process of completing National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental clearance with California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) as the NEPA Lead Agency, which will be complete as early as Spring 2024.

DISCUSSION

File #: 2023-0325, File Type: Budget Agenda Number: 40.

On June 28, 2022, Metro issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a Construction Management Support Services Contract to support the delivery of the Link US Project. The CMSSC contract is a cost reimbursable fixed fee contract.

Staff is seeking contract authorization for Preconstruction Services at this time. The Preconstruction Services will include assistance with CM/GC procurement, constructability reviews, estimating, negotiating and early works inspection and management. Staff will advance the Construction Support Services portion of the project after the design work and preconstruction services are complete and after the Construction LOP is authorized by the Board. The overall contract is expected to have a final value of approximately \$75 million and a duration of up to 11 years for all services required to construct Phase A of the Link US project, including CM/GC Procurement, Preconstruction, Construction, Testing and Commissioning, and Contract Closeout.

Annual Work Plan (AWP)

Since the CMSSC contract is a cost reimbursable fixed fee contract, consultant services will be performed using Annual Work Plans (AWP). Each AWP will include negotiated direct labor rates, indirect cost rates, general and administrative expenses, if any, a fixed fee, and negotiated hours for the level of effort to match the work. The AWPs will be within the Board approved funding amount for the project, which is funded from the current Board approved Preconstruction Budget, or ultimately the Board approved Life of Project Budget. The initial AWP is anticipated to be an amount not-to-exceed \$3,500,000.

Metro shall ensure that strict project controls are in place prior to approving each AWP to closely monitor the CMSSC's budget and AWP schedules. No funds will be obligated until the AWP is approved and confirmed to be within the Board approved funding for the contract.

Metro staff will begin onboarding CMSSC consultants immediately following contract execution and in a level of effort that matches the schedule and pace of the project.

Pre-Construction LOP Budget

On May 26, 2022, the Metro Board approved a Preconstruction Budget of \$297.818 million for the Preconstruction Work of the Link US Phase A Project consisting of remaining planning, environmental, preliminary engineering, final design, all third-party work, early demolition work, real estate acquisitions, and all associated soft costs.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

The Link US project is being planned and designed in accordance with Metro and Metrolink standards, as well as state and federal requirements. The award of the CMSSC for Phase A of the Link US project will have no impact on safety.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The aforementioned AWP(s) under this contract will be funded under the Board approved Preconstruction Budget. The Preconstruction Budget is anticipated to fund the project through the Preconstruction period, which includes Final Design and Construction Pricing with the CM/GC Contractor. This is a multi-year project and budgeting for future fiscal years will be the responsibility of the Project Manager, Cost Center Manager, and the Chief Program Management Officer.

Impact to Budget

The funding requirement for the first AWP in the amount not-to-exceed \$3,500,000 is included in the approved Preconstruction Budget for cost center 2415 under Link US project, 460089. The funding sources for the authorized Preconstruction Budget in the amount of \$297.818 million is comprised of Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP), State Transit Improvement Program (STIP), and Measure R 3% Regional Rail. These funds are not eligible for Metro bus/rail operating or capital budget expenses.

EQUITY PLATFORM

The Link US Project will provide better transit connectivity and increase rail service capacity by as much as 60%, which will contribute to the estimated 200,000 passengers per weekday by 2028. The improved rail service will provide better access to the Antelope Valley and San Bernardino lines and make it easier for riders in Equity Focus Communities (EFCs) along the lines to get to jobs, housing, and appointments and access the greater LA Metro public transportation system at Los Angeles Union Station. Annual household income, automobile availability, and employment levels are lowest on the Antelope Valley and San Bernardino Lines. By 2040, the weekday trains to these communities are expected to expand from 68 to 96 weekday trains.

For this project, a 25% SBE and a 3% DVBE goal was established.

The Link US Project will also result in reduced train and idling times, saving as much as 5 minutes for each ride linking the counties of San Diego, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara to Los Angeles Union. The reduced train and idling times will result in fuel savings and emission reductions per train. Further, it is estimated that the Link US Project will generate 4,500 jobs during construction, resulting in over 200 permanent jobs.

The Link US Project will improve equity outcomes by improving the quality of life for low-income residents including those at the William Mead Homes: the first affordable housing project in the City of Los Angeles constructed in the 1950s and located within the Metro Equity Focused Areas. Such improvements include a new sound wall that will be designed to reduce noise externalities from train operations and future increases in train operations. The improvements will also include quiet-zone safety improvements at the railroad crossing on N. Main Street to reduce the train horn noise in the area.

The project will also improve accessibility and user experience for passengers at LAUS by replacing all ramps between the passageway and the train platforms with ADA-compliant elevators and modern escalators; including additional transit amenities such as restrooms, waiting areas, retail, etc.; and

improving wayfinding to allow more seamless transfer of transportation services by including new static and modern dynamic signage installations within the Project limits to be designed in English and Spanish and other accommodations to assist those with hearing and/or visual impairments.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The Link US project supports the following Strategic Goals:

- Strategic Goal 1: Provide high-quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling. The proposed run-through tracks would increase regional and intercity rail capacity, reduce train idling at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS), enable one-seat rides from Santa Barbara County to San Diego County through LAUS, and accommodate a new high-quality transportation option such as the High-Speed Rail in Southern California.
- Strategic Goal 2: Deliver outstanding trip experiences for all users of the transportation system. The proposed new passenger concourse and the new outdoor plaza (West Plaza) would improve customer experience and satisfaction by enhancing transit and retail amenities at LAUS and improving access to train platforms with new escalators and elevators.
- Strategic Goal 4: Transform LA County through regional collaboration and national leadership. The project requires close collaboration with many local, regional, state, and federal partners including the City of Los Angeles, SCRRA, LOSSAN Authority, Caltrans, CHSRA, CalSTA, FRA, and Amtrak

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board may choose not to move forward with approval to award the contract to LAN. This is not recommended because our only option would be to cancel and re-procure and this delay in awarding the contract would adversely impact the overall delivery of the LINK-US project. Furthermore, this may impact grant funding agreements with TIRCP and CHSRA.

NEXT STEPS

After the Board approval of this CMSSC Contract, the Contracting Officer will issue the notice to proceed in accordance with Metro Procurement Policies and Procedures.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Procurement Summary

Attachment B - DEOD Summary

Prepared by:

Scott McConnell, Executive Officer, Program Management, (213) 922-4980

Tim Lindholm, Deputy Chief Program Management Officer, (213) 922 -7297 Debra Avila, Deputy Chief Vendor/Contract Management (213) 418-3051

Reviewed by: Sameh Ghaly, Interim Chief Program Management Officer (213)418-3369

Stephanie N. Wiggins

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES (CMSS) FOR LINK UNION STATION CM/GC CONTRACT NO. RFP AE83177E0130

1.	Contract Number: AE83177E0130			
2.	Recommended Vendor: Lockwood, Andrews, & Newnam, Inc.			
3.	Type of Procurement (check one): I	FB ☐ RFP 🛛 RFP-A&E		
	☐ Non-Competitive ☐ Modification	☐ Task Order		
4.	Procurement Dates:			
	A. Issued : June 28, 2022			
	B. Advertised/Publicized: June 28, 2022	2		
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: July 21, 2	022		
	D. Proposals Due: September 20, 2022			
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: November 21, 2022			
	F. Organizational Conflict of Interest Review Completed: May 16, 2023			
	G. Protest Period End Date: Est. June 23, 2023			
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: Two hundred fiftynine (259)	Proposals Received: Six (6)		
6.	Contract Administrator: Diana Sogomonyan Telephone Number: (213) 922 - 7243			
7.	Project Manager: Scott McConnell	Telephone Number : (213) 922 - 4980		

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve the award of Contract No. AE83177E0130 to provide Construction Management Support Services (CMSS) for Link Union Station CM/GC; subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest(s).

The CMSS Consultant will assist Metro in the management of the Link US Project by providing preconstruction and construction support services for Phase A and preconstruction services for Phase B (Phase B Construction Support Services is an optional scope of services). The Scope of Services for CMSS includes services critical to control the design to budget, assist in the negotiation of a construction contract with the Link US Construction Manager/General Contractor (to be selected under a separate procurement), and assist Metro in managing construction of Phase A to ensure completion within budget and on schedule. Work Plans for the CMSS Consultant will be negotiated annually, subject to availability of funds.

This was a qualification-based procurement 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 (A&E) services. Cost was not an evaluation factor. Metro will award a Cost Reimbursable-Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) type contract. The contract is subject to

available funds based on negotiated Annual Work Plans. The first Annual Work Plan covers required Construction Management (CM) support services during the remaining Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 and FY2024.

A Letter of Guarantee will be executed for the Project/Construction Manager, Lead Estimator, and Lead Facilitator for Phase A and the Vertical Construction Manager under Phase B, to ensure proposed personnel are actually available to support the project. The Contract includes a Special Provision that subjects the Contractor to Liquidated Damages should the Contractor fail to provide the proposed key personnel.

Metro issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) AE83177E0130, Construction Management Support Services for Link Union Station CM/GC, on June 28, 2022. Metro advertised the RFP in various newspapers in general circulation: LA Watts Times, Asian Week, Los Angeles Daily News, Riverside Press Enterprise, LA Opinion, Dodge Construction News, and Engineering News Record. Notifications were also sent to 3,498 firms and to an additional 880 SBE Certified firms and 247 DVBE Certified firms listed in Metro's Vendor database that had the applicable NAICS codes.

A virtual pre-proposal conference was held on July 21, 2022, in accordance with California Governor Executive Order N-33-20 related to COVID-19. One hundred and seventy-one (171) individuals including eighty-two (82) different firms attended the pre-proposal conference. Two hundred fifty-nine (259) individuals from various firms downloaded the RFP Package from Metro's Vendor Portal.

Five (5) Amendments were issued during the Solicitation phase of this RFP and included the following summary updates:

<u>Amendment No. 1, issued on July 12, 2022, to revise Section III – Proposal</u> Requirements/Forms as follows:

- Submittal Requirements Section 1.2: Revised to refer Proposers to the content summary in Exhibits (Solicitation) Exhibit 17 Submittal Requirements for each Volume of the Proposal Content.
- Exhibits (Solicitation) Exhibit 3 Evaluation Criteria: Other Evaluation Factors updated.
- Exhibits (Solicitation)Exhibit 14: Annual Work Plan Spreadsheet was replaced in its entirety.

Amendment No. 2, issued on July 15, 2022, to revise Section II – Proposal Instructions and Section IV – Contract Documents (Sample) as follows:

 All reference to Local Small Business Enterprise (LSBE) Preference was deleted from Diversity & Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) Instructions since it was not adopted at the time: DI-01 – Instructions to Bidders/Proposers AND Exhibit D DEOD SBE/DVBE Contract Compliance Manual (Non-Federal); and DI-01 clarified to include reference to CA Department of General Services (DGS). Amendment No. 3, issued on August 3, 2022, to revise Section I – Letter of Invitation, Section II – Proposal Instructions, Section III – Proposal Requirements/Forms, and Section IV – Contract Documents (Sample) as follows:

- LOI-01 Notice and Invitation: Proposal Due Date was extended for an additional two weeks.
- LOI-07 Basis of Award clarified.
- Exhibits (Solicitation) Exhibit 5 Proposal Letter: Validity period of Proposals was updated.
- Exhibit A Scope of Services Attachment 1: Description of Positions: position qualifications for two positions were clarified.
- Exhibit J. Construction Safety and Security Manual was replaced with new version - Revision 5.0: January 2022.

Amendment No. 4, issued on August 19, 2022, to revise Section III – Proposal Requirements/Forms, and Section IV – Contract Documents (Sample) as follows:

- Exhibit 14 Annual Work Plan: was replaced in its entirety.
- Exhibit A Scope of Services Attachment 5 Phase A Cost Estimate Templates on an Open Book Basis PDF was replaced in its entirety.

Amendment No. 5, issued on September 2, 2022, to revise Section I – Letter of Invitation, Section III – Proposal Requirements/Forms, and Section IV – Contract Documents (Sample) as follows:

- LOI-01 Notice and Invitation: Period of Performance of the Contract was revised to 11 Years and Proposal Due Date was revised to Tuesday, September 20, 2022.
- Submittal Requirements Section 1.1: 100-page proposal limit clarified.
- Exhibit 13 Staffing Plan: PDF Spreadsheet was replaced in its entirety.
- Exhibit 14 Annual Work Plan: Excel and PDF Spreadsheet was replaced in its entirety.
- Exhibit 15 Link US:List of Quantities Based Phase A 35% Design, items 329 thru 337 were deleted.
- Exhibit A Scope of Services Attachment 5 Phase A Cost Estimate Templates on an Open Book Basis: Link Union Station Project Construction Cost Estimate Summary page and Calculations were replaced in its entirety.

A total of six (6) proposals were received on the proposal due date, September 20, 2022, from the following firms listed below in alphabetical order:

- 1. ABA Global, Inc.
- 2. Jacobs Project Management Company
- 3. Lockwood, Andrews, & Newnam, Inc.
- 4. Parsons / Mott McDonald (Joint Venture)
- 5. Psomas
- Stantec Consulting Services Inc.

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of Metro staff from Highway Programs, Quality Assurance / Compliance, and Regional Rail departments was convened to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals received.

The recommendation of the most qualified Proposer is based on the PET's assessment of the written proposals and oral presentations. Pursuant to the RFP, the PET scored the proposals in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria and Points set forth in the RFP. The most qualified Proposer was determined to be the Proposer that submitted the highest scored proposal.

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

I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A	1000	Points
A. Proposer's Project Team and CM/GC Experience B. Project Management Approach to Preconstruction Support Services C. Successful Negotiation Approach to a Firm Fixed Price Proposal D. Construction Management E. Third-Party Coordination and Approval F. Cost Management and Value Engineering	300 105 175 220 100 100	Points Points Points Points Points
II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B	350	Points
A. Proposer's Project Team and CM/GC Experience B. Successful Negotiation Approach to a Firm Fixed Price Proposal C. Construction Management D. Cost/Schedule Management and Value Engineering	140 55 110 45	Points Points Points Points
Total Available Points (Phase A and B)	1350	Points

The PET evaluated and scored the proposals and based on the initial scoring determined the Proposal submitted by ABA Global, Inc. was not within the competitive range and eliminated from further consideration. The competitive range included all of the other five proposals.

Metro scheduled Oral Presentations with all five (5) Proposers in the competitive range.

Virtual Oral Presentations were held on January 25, 2023, and January 27, 2023. In general, each proposer's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, and experience with all aspects of the required scope for successful oversight of the Link US CMGC contract. The proposing firms had the opportunity to present their key personnel as well as respond to the PET's questions. 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.

The PET ranked the proposals and assessed major strengths and weaknesses of the Proposers to determine the most qualified firm. The evaluation performed by the PET originally ranked Jacobs Project Management Company (Jacobs) as the highest and Lockwood, Andrews, & Newnam (LAN), Inc. was the second highest ranked proposer. However, during the protest process Metro subsequently determined the Jacobs team had an organizational conflict of interest with access to confidential information resulting in a significant competitive advantage over other potential proposers making the Jacobs team ineligible to receive a Contract under this procurement. Consequently, Metro is recommending the CMSS Contract be awarded to LAN as the most qualified firm.

C. Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm

LAN demonstrated thorough knowledge and understanding of the project and the potential constraints that may adversely impact the project. LAN proposed three very good Value Engineering (VE) and Constructability opportunities to save costs and reduce schedule. LAN illustrated an excellent use of Building Information Modeling (BIM) to enhance constructability reviews, including performing clash detection analysis, coordinating development of LOD 300 design BIM model and LOD 400 design BIM model.

LAN demonstrated substantial CM/GC and relevant experience on projects that were similar in scope and complexity as the Link US project. LAN proposed a team whose composition demonstrates a deep bench of expertise. Key personnel positions including the Project/Construction Manager, Lead Facilitator and Lead Estimator all have substantial CM/GC project delivery method experience.

The proposed Project / Construction Manager has 20 years senior-level project management experience in engineering and constructions projects,10 years of transit CM/GC experience and supported 10 CM/GC transit projects. On Denton County Transportation Authority's (DCTA) A-Train Commuter Rail CM/GC project, he served in the CMSS role and oversaw the project from preconstruction through revenue service. Other experiences include the DART, Green Line Extension, Southeast 2 Line Section CM/GC Project, and Santa Clara Valley Transit Transportation Authority (VTA / BART) Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Design-Build Project.

LAN's Third-party Liaison/Expeditor has 20 years of transportation project experience, including oversight and management of third-party issues on large projects and programs with the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, State of California, utility owners/agencies, and with other Stakeholders such as the CAHSR Authority, SCRRA, and Caltrans.

The results of the final scoring are shown below:

1	Firm / Evaluation Factor	Max Factor Weight	Max Points for Criteria	Total Average Score	Rank
2	Lockwood, Andrews, & Newnam, Inc.				
3	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	841.00	
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A)				
4		30.00%	300.00	261.25	
5	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	76.17	
	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
6	PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	146.37	
7	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	181.72	
8		10.00%	100.00	90.00	
9	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	85.50	
10	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	287.03	
11	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) -	40.00%	140.00	119.92	

APPROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 12 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 13 (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%) 14 (12.86%) D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - 14 (12.86%) 15 Total 16 Psomas I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% 17 of TOTAL 1350 Points) D. COSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT 19 SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%) D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points) A PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points) B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
12 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 43.08 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 13 (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%) 31.42% 110.00 90.20 D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - (12.86%) 12.86% 45.00 33.83 15 Total 1350.00 1128.03 1 16 Psomas		APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%) 31.42% 110.00 90.20	40		45 740/	FF 00	42.00	
13	12		15.71%	55.00	43.08	
D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - 14 (12.86%) 12.86% 45.00 33.83 15 Total 1350.00 1128.03 1 16 Psomas I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% 17 of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 1000.00 771.93 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) 18 (30.00%) 30.00% 300.00 238.02 B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT 19 SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%) 10.50% 105.00 80.05 C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) 17.50% 175.00 140.05 D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) 22.00% 220.00 161.97 E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B - (20.00%) 10.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B - (20.00%) 10.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B - (20.00%) 10.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B - (20.00%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17			0.4.400/			
AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - (12.86%) 12.86% 45.00 33.83 15 Total 1350.00 1128.03 1 16 Psomas I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% 17 of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 1000.00 771.93 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) (30.00%) 30.00% 300.00 238.02 B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT 19 SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%) 10.50% 105.00 80.05 C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) 17.50% 175.00 140.05 D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) 22.00% 220.00 161.97 E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND 22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 77.40 11. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B - (20.00%) 20.00% 2	13	/ /	31.42%	110.00	90.20	
14						
15 Total 1350.00 1128.03 1		,				
16 Psomas		,	12.86%			
I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	15	Total		1350.00	1128.03	1
SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	16	Psomas				
17		I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
17		SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A				
A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) 18 (30.00%) B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT 19 SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%) C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) III. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 10.00% 350.00 266.67						
CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A)	17	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	771.93	
18 (30.00%) 30.00% 300.00 238.02 B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT 19 SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%) 10.50% 105.00 80.05 C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) 17.50% 175.00 140.05 D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) 22.00% 220.00 161.97 E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND 22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND				
B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT 9 SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%) 10.50% 105.00 80.05 C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) 17.50% 175.00 140.05 D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE A) - (22.00%) 220.00 161.97 E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE SINGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT						
TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%) C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% Of TOTAL 1350 Points) A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	18		30.00%	300.00	238.02	
19 SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%) 10.50% 105.00 80.05 C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) 17.50% 175.00 140.05 D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) 220.00 161.97 E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND 22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH				
C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) 175.00 140.05 D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) 220.00 161.97 E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND 22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT				
APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE 20 PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%) 17.50% 175.00 140.05 D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) 220.00 161.97 E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND 22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	19	SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	80.05	
20		C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND 22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26%) 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 100.00% 100.00% 350.00 266.67 40.00% 100.00% 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
21 (PHASE A) - (22.00%) 22.00% 220.00 161.97 E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND 10.00% 100.00 74.45 22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 100.00% 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	20	PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	140.05	
E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND 22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - 25 (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT				
22 APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 74.45 F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 10.00% 100.00 77.40 II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 15.71% 55.00 44.17	21	(PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	161.97	
F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE 23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - 25 (40.00%) B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT						
23 ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%) 10.00% 100.00 77.40	22	APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	74.45	
II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points)		F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE				
SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points)	23	ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	77.40	
SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points)						
(100% of total 350 points, which is 26% 24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - 25 (40.00%) B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
24 of TOTAL 1350 Points) 100.00% 350.00 266.67 A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17		SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B -				
A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - 25 (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		(100% of total 350 points, which is 26%				
CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - 25 (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	24	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	266.67	
25 (40.00%) 40.00% 140.00 108.33 B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND				
B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) -				
APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	25		40.00%	140.00	108.33	
PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT 44.17						
26 CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%) 15.71% 55.00 44.17 C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT		PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B				
	26	CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	<u> 15.7</u> 1%	55.00	44.17	
27 (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%) 31.42% 110.00 79.67		C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT			_	
	27	(PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	79.67	

	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT				
	AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) -				
28	(12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	34.50	
29	Total		1350.00	1038.60	2
30	Parsons / Mott McDonald (Joint Venture)				
	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
	SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A				
	(100% of total 1000 points, which is 74%				
31	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	754.87	
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND				
	CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A)				
32	(30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	230.7833	
	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH				
	TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT	40 -00/	40=00		
33	SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	75.20	
	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
	APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE	47.500/	475.00	444.70	
34	PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	141.78	
0.5	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	00.000/	000.00	450.00	
35	(PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	159.23	
20	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND	40.000/	400.00	70.00	
36	APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	72.30	
27	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE	10.000/	100.00	75 57	
37	ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	75.57	
	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
	SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B -				
	(100% of total 350 points, which is 26%				
38	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	267.97	
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND	100100,0			
	CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) -				
39	(40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	109.42	
	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
	APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
	PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B				
40	CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	41.73	
	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT				
41	(PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	82.57	
	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT				
	AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) -				
42	(12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	34.25	
43	Total		1350.00	1022.83	3
44	Stantec Consulting Services Inc.]
	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
45	SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A	100.00%	1000.00	745.30	

	(100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)				
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A)				
46	(30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	232.65	
	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH				
	TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT				
47	SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	78.92	
	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
	APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
48		17.50%	175.00	120.60	
	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT				
49	(PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	165.12	
	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND				
50	/ / /	10.00%	100.00	74.37	
	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE	40.5-51	4		
51	ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	73.65	
	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
	SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B -				
	(100% of total 350 points, which is 26%				
52	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	263.42	
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND				
	CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) -	40.000/		400.00	
53	,	40.00%	140.00	106.63	
	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
	APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
5 4	PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B	45 740/	55.00	44.50	
54	CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	41.53	
	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	0.4.400/	440.00	04.00	
55	/ /	31.42%	110.00	81.02	
	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT				
50	AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) -	40.000/	45.00	0.4.00	
56	(12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	34.23	_
57	Total		1350.00	1008.72	4
58	ABA Global, Inc.				
	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
	SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A				
	(100% of total 1000 points, which is 74%	400 000	400000		
59	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	206.17	
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND				
00	CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) 300	00.000	000.00	444400=	
60	pts/1000 pts (30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	114.1667	
<u> </u>	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH	40	40-05	,	
61	TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT	10.50%	105.00	11.60	

	SERVICES (PHASE A) (105 pts of 1000				
	pts = 10.50%)				
	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
	APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
	PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (1 75 pts of				
62	1000pts =17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	1.00	
	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT				
	(PHASE A) – (220 pts of 1000pts =				
63	22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	16.33	
	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND				
	APPROVAL (PHASE A) – (100 pts of 1000				
64	pts = 10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	57.13	
	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE				
0.5	ENGINEERING (PHASE A) – (100 pts of	40.000/	400.00	5.00	
65	1000 pts = 10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	5.93	
	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
	SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B –				
	(100% of total 350 points, which is 26%				
66	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	40.08	
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND				
	CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) – (140	40.000			
67	pts of 350 pts = 40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	37.05	
	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
	APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
	PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B				
CO	CONSTRUCTION OPTION – (55 pts of	45 740/	FF 00	0.00	
68	350 pts = 15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	0.00	
	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT				
60	(PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) – (100 pts	24 420/	110.00	2.02	
69	of 350 pts = 31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	3.03	
	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) –				
70		12.86%	45.00	0.00	
70	(45 pts of 350 pts = 12.86%)	12.0070			
71	Total - Not in Competitive Range		1350.00	246.25	
72	Jacobs Project Management Company				
	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND				
	SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A				
70	(100% of total 1000 points, which is 74%	400 000/	4000 00	040.00	
73	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	842.93	
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND				
71	CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A)	20.000/	200.00	250 27	
74	(30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	259.27	

	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT				
75	SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	86.15	
	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION	1010070		30	
	APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
76	PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	150.23	
	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT				
77		22.00%	220.00	177.85	
	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND				
78	/ / /	10.00%	100.00	85.67	
70	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE	40.000/	400.00	00.77	
79	ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	83.77	
	IL EVALUATION ODITEDIA AND				
	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B -				
	(100% of total 350 points, which is 26%				
80	of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	301.07	
	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND	10010070	000100		
	CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) -				
81	(40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	122.23	
	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION				
	APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE				
	PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B				
82	CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	46.42	
	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT				
83	(PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	95.20	
	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT				
0.4	AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - (12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	27.22	
84		12.00%	45.00	37.22	
85	Total - Ineligible for an award due to OCI		1350.00	1144.00	

D. Cost/Price Analysis

A cost analysis of the elements of cost including labor rates, indirect rates and other direct costs will be completed in accordance with Metro's Procurement Policies and Procedures, including fact-finding, clarification and cost analysis to determine the cost factors are fair and reasonable. Metro will negotiate and establish 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 of performance of the Scope of Services, for the first Annual Work Plan for the remainder of FY23 and FY24. Work Plans for the CMSS Consultant will be negotiated annually throughout the contract term, subject to availability of funds.

E. Background on Recommended Contractor

LAN was founded in 1935 and is a national, full-service civil engineering firm, offering planning, engineering, and program and construction management services. LAN specializes in rail transit and CMGC delivery, with a history of construction management/owner's representative services. LAN has partnered with California transit agencies to deliver rail transit projects, including the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT), San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), and Caltrain, among others.

Previously, LAN provided design and design services during construction of the Silicon Valley Bart Berryessa Extension Design-Build Project, a 10-mile, \$860 million extension of the BART system into Santa Clara County. LAN also provided project management for the DART Red/Blue Line Platform extension CMGC project. LAN led a joint-venture to provide project management support services, including planning, procurement, design, and construction management services for the \$300 million A-train Commuter Rail CMGC Implementation for Denton County Transportation Authority (DCTA) in Denton Texas. Located along the old Denton Branch (formerly Union Pacific Railroad), the alignment is a shared corridor with a Class 1 railroad operator for approximately 10 miles of the 21-mile corridor.

They are headquartered in Austin, Texas and have a local office located in the heart of downtown Los Angeles, at 550 S. Hope Street, 27th floor, Los Angeles, CA 90071.

DEOD SUMMARY

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES (CMSS) FOR LINK UNION STATION CM/GC CONTRACT NO. RFP AE83177E0130

A. Small Business Participation

This procurement is funded in whole are in part with California High Speed Rail funds (CHSR). As such, CHSR has required the use of its Small Business Program goals of 25% Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal and a 3% Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) for this solicitation. The CHSR Small Business Program included Department of General Services certified SB, SB (Micro), and Metro certified SBE firms. Consultant services will be performed using Annual Work Plans (AWP).

Lockwood, Andrews & Newman, Inc. (LAN) a LEO A Daly Company made a 29% SBE and 6% DVBE commitment for the overall contract. DEOD will determine LANI's SBE/DVBE commitments for the Year 1 work plan at the conclusion of final negotiations. Additionally, as scope and budget are identified for each annual work plan, LANI will identify its corresponding commitments to listed SBE/DVBE firms.

Small Business	25% SBE	Small Business Commitment (Overall Contract)	29% SBE
Goal	3% DVBE		6% DVBE
		Small Business Commitment - Year 1	TBD SBE TBD DVBE

SBE	Subcontractors	DGS	Metro	%	
		SB/SB (Micro)	SBE	Committed	
1.	D'Leon Consulting Engineers		X	TBD	
2.	AIX Consulting		X	TBD	
3.	Applied Earthworks, Inc.	X		TBD	
4.	Barrios & Associates	X	X	TBD	
5.	Cabrinha, Hearn & Associates	X	X	TBD	
6.	Impact Sciences, Inc.	X	X	TBD	
7.	Make Good Company	X	X	TBD	
8.	Padilla & Associates, Inc.	X		TBD	
9.	PPM Group	Х	Х	TBD	
	Total SBE Commitment 29%				

DVI	BE Subcontractors	% Committed
1.	Conaway Geomatics Inc.	TBD
2.	Leland Saylor Associates	TBD
3.	MA Engineering	TBD
	Total DVBE Commitment	6%

B. Local Small Business Enterprise (LSBE) Preference

The LSBE preference is not applicable to this CHSR-funded solicitation.

C. Contractor Outreach and Mentoring Plan (COMP)

COMP is not applicable for this A&E contract. In accordance with the California Government Code Section 4525, et seq., Metro shall use qualifications-based competitive procedures for the procurement of architectural and engineering services, as defined in the code. Only a competitor's qualifications to perform the architectural and engineering services are to be evaluated and the most qualified proposing firm to be selected.

D. <u>Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability</u>

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

E. 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).

F. <u>Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy</u>

Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is not applicable to this Contract. This contract is for Construction Management Support Services (CMSS) for Link Union Station CM/GC. PLA/CCP is applicable only to construction contracts that have a construction related value in excess of \$2.5 million.