

To	From
XX	BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS
	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CC	DED - DEVELOPMENT
	DED - FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION
	DED - OPERATIONS
	DED - BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
	DED - EXTERNAL RELATIONS
	SR DIRECTOR, COMMUNICATIONS
	SR DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
	ACCOUNTING
	BUSINESS & TRADE DEVELOPMENT
	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
	CITY ATTORNEY
	COMMISSION OFFICE
	CONSTRUCTION
CC	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE
	CONTRACTS & PURCHASING
	DEBT & TREASURY

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
HARBOR DEPARTMENT

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

January 14, 2014

To	Transmittal 4		From
	ENGINEERING		XX
	ENVIRONMENTAL		
	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT		
	GOODS MOVEMENT		
	GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS		
	GRAPHIC SERVICES		
	HUMAN RESOURCES		
	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		
	MANAGEMENT AUDIT		
	MEDIA RELATIONS		
CC	PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEV.		
	PORT PILOTS		
	PORT POLICE		
	PUBLIC RELATIONS		
	REAL ESTATE		
	RISK MANAGEMENT		
	WHARFINGERS		

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT SELECTION FOR ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES FOR BERTH 57 WHARF & GROUND IMPROVEMENTS AND SIGNAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS

The Request for Proposals (RFP) for engineering design services for the Berth 57 Wharf & Ground Improvements and Signal Street Improvements project was advertised on September 10, 2013. Six (6) RFP's were submitted to the Port of Los Angeles (Port) on October 17, 2013. All six (6) firms were invited for oral interviews held on Wednesday, November 13 and Thursday, November 14, 2013. Attached is a list of the consultants teams (Attachment No. 1)

The evaluators for the interviews were Chris Grossi, Lily Becaria, Dina Aryan-Zahlan (Engineering Division), Dave Mathewson (Planning & Economic Development Division), and Barb Garrett (Construction & Maintenance Division). Each consultant team's proposal and interview were rated based on the attached RFP selection Evaluation Form which was included as exhibit E of the RFP (Attachment No. 2). The scores for each team are based on the written proposal and interview as rated by each reviewer (Attachment No. 3).

Based on the evaluation scores of the written proposals and interviews, it is recommended that the following consultant be invited to enter into negotiations with the Port for the Engineering Design Services for the Berth 57 Wharf & Ground Improvements and Signal Street Improvements:

1. Moffatt & Nichol

It is recommended that the following consultants be informed that their teams were not selected:

1. CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc.
2. KPFF Consulting Engineers
3. URS Corporation Americas
4. JMC2
5. DR Consultants and Designers, Inc.

LO # 14-301

The original proposed scope of work included the Berth 57 Wharf Structural Repairs, Warehouse 57 Shed Foundation Ground Improvements, and Signal Street Improvements. The consultants scope of work will be reduce to include the Berth 57 Wharf Structural Repairs and Warehouse 57 Foundation Ground Improvements. The Signal Street Improvements will be designed by the Port's Engineering Division. The consultants design fees will be negotiated to reflect this revised scope of services.

Although Moffatt and Nichol's fee proposal was higher than others (except URS), their design approach will likely have a lower initial cost, simplify the building design, and reduce future maintenance costs.

It is anticipated negotiations will start February 2014. Design service will commence upon contract execution and Board approval which is anticipated April 2014.

Please review the attached summary sheet. If you should have any questions or comments, please contact Chris Grossi at extension 3096.



ANTONIO GIOIELLO
Chief Harbor Engineer



MICHAEL R. CHRISTENSEN
Deputy Executive Director

APPROVED:



GARY LEE MOORE, P.E.
Interim Executive Director

CAG:tm
25006m2
25006 1-1

Attachments: Evaluation Form
 Sub-consultant Summary Sheet
 Score Sheet

BIRTH ST WWAFF AND GROUND IMPROVEMENTS AND SOIL STREET IMPROVEMENTS - PLANNING AND DESIGN SERVICES
 List of Firm Subcontractors

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100

Attachment No. 1

EXHIBIT E

RFP SELECTION EVALUATION FORM

PROJECT: BERTH 57 WHARF RETROFIT & GROUND IMPROVEMENTS & SIGNAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS

SCORING GUIDELINES:

Rater's Score: (Range 0-5) - 0=not included/non responsive; 1=Marginal Abilities, Serious Deficiencies; 2=Adequate with Minor Deficiencies; 3=Adequate, Standard-Acceptable; 4=Well Qualified; 5=Exceptionally Well Qualified.

Weighing Factor: Input using a range of 1 through 6, with 1 being of relative lower importance and 6 being relative highest importance. You may use each number (1 through 6) more than once; however, in establishing weights, the total of all the weighing factors (A –E) must equal 20. Example: 3+2+6+4+5=20 or 3+3+3+6+5=20

Weighted Score= Rater's Score multiplied by (x) Weighing Factor. Totals should be calculated for each criterion.

Total score = Sum of all weighted scores.

Firm Name	Evaluated by	Date

CRITERIA TO BE RATED		RATER'S SCORE	WEIGHING FACTOR	WEIGHTED SCORE
A. Firm Qualifications, Experience and References	How long has the company been in business? Has the company done similar work? Level of expertise in subject matters areas?		5	
B. Project Organization, Personnel and Staffing	Qualification and experience of proposed personnel for requested services? On-site availability of team and project manager? Locally based firm or team?		4	
C. Project Approach, Work Plan, Management and Timeline	Quality of proposed work plan to meet project requirements? Quality of project management and timeline?		4	
D. Rates, Fees and Budget Control	Competitive rates and fees proposed? Are proposed budget management, fees and staff hours proposed and clearly defined?		4	
E. Clarity and Comprehensiveness of the Proposal	Is the proposal clear, comprehensive, and understandable?		3	
	Maximum points possible=100		A+B+C+D+E=20	Total Points=

Proposal/Interview Evaluation Scores and Ranking
Design Services for B57 Wharf & Ground Improvements and Signal Street Improvements

Teams	Chris	Dina	Barb	Lily	Dave	Total	Rank
Moffatt & Nichol	96	71.5	65	76	86	394.5	1
CH2M Hill	80	69.5	64	75.5	89.5	378.5	2
KPFF	89	69.5	60	62	84	364.5	3
URS	84	63.5	50.5	75.5	76.5	350	4
JMC2	79	60	42.5	71	67.5	320	5
DR Consultants and Designers	75	60	40	57	76	308	6