

ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT



STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 8/7/2019

Staff Report No. 18-230b

TO: AC Transit Board of Directors
FROM: Michael A. Hursh, General Manager
SUBJECT: Award of A&E On-Call Contracts

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):

Consider awarding six (6) on-call Architectural and Engineering (A&E) contracts to Parsons Transportations Group, Inc.; Chow Engineering, Inc.; Interactive Resources, Inc.; STV, Inc.; Mott MacDonald, LLC.; and Kimley Horn & Associates, Inc.

BUDGETARY/FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no immediate fiscal impact from the award of these contracts. Only when a task order is issued under one of the six on-call contracts will there be an impact. The maximum value of each individual tasking will be equal to the unused portion of the annual allocation for that specific contractor. The minimum value of each task order is \$2,500.

BACKGROUND/RATIONALE:

On-Call A&E contracts will provide the District with access to specialized architectural and engineering services as well as short-term staff augmentation to accommodate the capital project's program needs. These needs cover a variety of A&E areas, which include, but are not limited to, architectural, civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, landscape, cost and scheduling. Many of these specialties are only needed for a limited time period ranging from weeks to months, depending on the specific project need.

The original "Permission to Solicit" authorized by the Board on January 23, 2019, provided for up to five contract awards. After evaluation of the Statements of Qualifications received in response to the Request for Qualifications, staff is requesting the award be increased to six contracts. The reasons for increasing the award from five to six include:

1. The evaluation results indicate that the top six firms are tightly clustered in the competitive range (80% and above). See Table 4 below.
2. There is a significant gap between the top six firms (over 80%) and the next highest firm at 65%.
3. The addition of the sixth firm expands the breadth of the core competencies of the selected consultant panel.

Staff is proposing six on-call A&E contracts, each valued at a maximum of \$1,000,000 per year during an initial three-year offering period. Each contract will have a five-year period of performance for completion of the work authorized during the offering period. This is to ensure that all taskings issued during the three-year tasking period will be complete prior to the final expiration of the contract term. These contracts are on-call, task order-based contracts. When the need for services under these contracts is identified, the District will order the services by issuing a task order to the best qualified firm followed by a purchase order.

The procurement approach used was a qualifications-based, price not determinative, “Brooks Act”, as defined by Federal Transit Administration Circular 4220.1F Rev 3. It utilized a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) procurement approach.

The procurement followed the timeline in Table 1. The results of the solicitation are in Table 2.

Table 1. Procurement Timeline

Board authorization to issue solicitation	01-23-2019
Solicitation issued	02-22-2019
Solicitation closed	04-24-2019
Evaluations complete	06-10-2019

Table 2. Solicitation Results

Number of DBE firms solicited	460
Number of firms responded to RFQ	9
Number of firms determined to be responsive	9
Number of firms evaluated	9

The evaluation panel was comprised of four representatives from AC Transit’s Planning and Engineering Department. The panel evaluated the proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria listed in the solicitation and shown below in Table 3.

Table 3. Qualifications Evaluation Criteria

Relevant Past Performance	20%
Technical Specialized Experience	30%
Professional Qualifications and Competence of Team / Depth of Firm	25%
Capacity of Firm to Accomplish the Work in the Required Time	20%
Quality Control Program	5%

The panel’s scores of the six (6) highest ranking firms are shown in Table 4. The highest scoring companies are the most qualified to undertake the scope of services and are deemed both responsive and responsible. In accordance with Board Policy. The evaluation was conducted using the criteria set forth in the RFQ (2019-1456) while considering the kind of services that may be required, also as prescribed by the RFQ.

Table 4. Evaluation Results

<u>A&E Proposing Firm</u>	<u>Weighted Points</u>	<u>Percentage Scoring</u>
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	1,935	96.8%
Chow Engineering, Inc.	1,865	93.3%
Interactive Resources, Inc.	1,845	92.3%
STV, Inc.	1,777	88.9%
Mott MacDonald, LLC	1,755	87.8%
Kimley Horn & Associates, Inc.	1,630	84.0%

Staff recommends awarding six (6) on-call contracts for professional A&E contracts to Parsons Transportations Group, Inc.; Chow Engineering, Inc.; Interactive Resources, Inc.; STV, Inc.; Mott MacDonald, LLC., and Kimley Horn & Associates, Inc.

ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES:

Award of these contracts will permit staff to utilize specialized skills required to support critical project activity. Staff is unable to identify any disadvantages in making these awards.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS:

Staff considered three alternative approaches to providing the District with the kinds of services envisioned for these contracts; however, it is important to note that having these contracts in place would not preclude the District from using any of these alternative methods.

1. Hire employees. Adding staff to handle the wide range of specialties and paying them fulltime wages and benefits when they are only needed part of the time. Staff does not recommend this alternative because it is not a prudent use of District funds.
2. Individual Procurements. The District could opt to solicit proposals for A&E services as the need arises. Staff does not recommend this alternative because it would result in lengthened implementation schedules and increased workload for project managers and contract specialists with no corresponding benefit.
3. Temporary Employees. The District could use temporary employees, perhaps hired through a placement agency, for the duration of a particular project. Staff does not recommend this approach because a project typically requires a specialty for a limited number of hours per month over a several month duration.

Alternatively, this District could remain consistent with the original intention of awarding only five on-call contracts. While this approach would address the District's core needs, it would narrow the breadth of capabilities available to the District from the On-call A&E panel of consultants and reduce the District's flexibility in task order awards.

PRIOR RELEVANT BOARD ACTION/POLICIES:

Staff Report 18-230, Permission to Solicit On-Call Architectural and Engineering, October 10, 2018.

Staff Report 18-230a, Permission to Solicit On-Call Architectural and Engineering (revised), January 23, 2109.

Board Policy 465 - Procurement Policy

ATTACHMENTS:

None

Approved by:

Ramakrishna Pochiraju, Executive Director of Planning & Engineering

Reviewed by:

Denise C. Standridge, General Counsel

Claudia L. Allen, Chief Financial Officer

Gene Clark, Director of Procurement and Materials

Chris Andrichak, Director of Management and Budget

Phillip Halley, Contract Compliance Administrator

Prepared by:

Joe Callaway, Director of Capital Projects