

6. CURRENT AND COMPLETED PROJECTS



Metro Orange Line Balboa Blvd Station

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
Mount Vernon Viaduct PCM San Bernardino, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Project and Construction Manager for Design// Build Replacement of Mount Vernon Viaduct over BNSF Railway	SBCTA 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92410 Paula Beauchamp pbeauchamp@gosbcta.com 909.884.8276	\$15.8 Million	2024 (Const.)
Santa Margarita Parkway Bridge Hinge Repair, Rancho Santa Margarita	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Management for the 72-foot wide northern bridge hinge replacement. Includes replacement of the joint seal and assemblies and joint sidewalk armor at each abutment	City of Rancho Santa Margarita 22122 El Paseo, Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688 Tri Nguyen tnguyen@cityofrsm.org 949.635.1813	\$ 720,000	2021 (Const.)
Rosecrans/ Marquardt Grade Separation, Santa Fe Springs, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Alternatives Evaluation, PA&ED, and PS&E for new Grade Separation of Rosecrans Ave, Marquardt Ave and BNSF Railway	Metro Regional Rail One Gateway Plz, Los Angeles, CA90012, Dan Mahgerefteh MahgereftehD@metro.net 213.418.3219	\$ 6.6 Million	2023 (Const.)
High Speed Rail Project CP-2, CP-3 Contract, Fresno, Tulare and King Counties	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Independent Checking Engineer/Independent Site Engineer for 60 miles of the HSR Guideway including 50 high-speed rail and roadway bridges	California High Speed Rail Authority, Ben Ruiz benjamin.ruiz@hsr.ca.gov 559.558.5204	\$ 18 Million	2023
Higuera Street Bridge Replacement and Ballona Creek Bike Path Connectivity Projects, Culver City	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Management for 186-foot long bridge replacement . The project includes the construction of a crosswalk that connects to a bike and pedestrian path at the SE corner of the bridge.	City of Culver City, 9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, CA 90232 Sammy Romo Sammy.romo@culvercity.org 310-487-0211	\$ 900,000	2022 (Const.)

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
Scott Road Interchange Project Menifee, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Management Services	City of Menifee, 29844 Haun Road, Menifee, CA 92586, Carlos Geronimo cgeronimo@cityofmenifee.us; 951-723-3722	\$ 4.6M	2021
Division 20 Portal Widening & Turnback Facility Los Angeles, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Management Services	LACMTA, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012 Matt Gallagher, PE gallagherm@metro.net 626-379-2070	\$ 13M	2023
Avenue 66 Grade Separation Mecca, Riverside, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Management Services	RCTD, 2950 Washington Street, Riverside, CA 92504 Ward Maxwell wmaxwell@rivco.org; 951-955-8614	\$ 2.7M	2021
Center Street Project, Los Angeles, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J/V Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Project/Construction Management	LACMTA, One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012 Kate Amissa – Senior Engineer amissahk@metro.net 213-418-3224	\$ 1.1M	2022
CV Sync Coachella Valley, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electrical Inspection Services	CVAG, 73-710 Fred Waring Drive Palm Desert, CA 92260, Ste #200 Eric Cowle, Trans. Program Mgr. ecowle@cvag.org, 760-346-1127	\$ 687K	2022

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
US 101/Chesebro Crossing, City of Agoura Hills, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>	Kelly Fisher, Public Works Project Manager 30001 Ladyface Court Agoura Hills, CA 91301 818.597.7338 kfisher@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us	\$ 2.3M	6/30/2021
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
LA Metro - Division 20 Portal Widening Turnback Project Los Angeles, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Construction Management; Design Review; Inspection; Safety Oversight; Aerial Mapping</p>	LA Metro c/o Anser Advisory 1820 E. First St., Ste. 410 Santa Ana, CA 92705 Mr. Brad Owen, PE, Exec. Officer Email: owenb@metro.net Tel: (213) 922-7158	\$ 5 Million	2023
LA Metro - East San Fernando Valley LRT Transit Corridor San Fernando Valley, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Design Engineering</p>	LA Metro c/o Gannett Fleming 601 S. Figueroa, Ste. 3880 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Mr. Eric Olson, PE, Vice President Email: eolson@gfnet.com Tel: (213) 624.0347, Ext. 8720	\$ 2.6 Million	2028
LA Metro - Metro Center Street CSSC Project Los Angeles, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Construction Management; Inspection; Safety Oversight; Aerial Mapping</p>	LA Metro c/o Anser Advisory 1820 E. First St., Ste. 410 Santa Ana, CA 92705 Ms. Kate Amissah, Senior Engineer Email: amissahk@metro.net; Tel:(213) 418-3224	\$ 600K	2023
LA Metro - Green Line Ext to Redondo Bch. S Bay PMSS Project Torrance, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Program Management Support; Design Review; Railroad Coordination;</p>	LA Metro c/o KKCS/Triunity JV 800 S. Figueroa, Ste. 1210 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Kavita Mehta, Dep. Exec. Officer, PM Email: mehtak@metro.net Tel:213-922-4921	\$ 300K	2027
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority Mt. Vernon Ave Viaduct Replacement Project San Bernardino, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Program Management Support; Design Review; Railroad Coordination; Traffic Engineering; Safety Oversight</p>	San Bernardino County Transportation Authority c/o Biggs Cordosa Assoc., Inc. 500 S. Main St., Ste. 400, Orange, CA 92868 Mr. Michael Thomas, SE, Principal Email: mthomas@biggscardosa.com Tel: (714) 550-4665	\$ 600K	2022

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
BRT on International	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brendan Kotler Bridge Development Partners (818) 674-6770	\$ 14,500	2020
Perris Blvd Corridor Safety Improvements	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>	Sharon Erb Engineering Department 24 South "D" Street, Suite 100 Perris, CA 92570 (951) 943-6504	\$ 170,000	Dec. 2021
Harbor Bay, Island/ McCartney, Park Street	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>	Scott Wikstrom, P.E. City Engineer City of Alameda Public Works (510) 747-7937 swilkstrom@alamedaca.gov	\$ 40,000	July 2020
Bus Route Evaluation Tri Delta Transit	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>	Joe Chappelle ECCC Transit (Tri Delta Transit) 801 Wilbur Ave. Antioch, CA 94509 (925) 754-6622 procurement@eccta.org	\$ 400,000	2021
Coachella Valley Regional TSSP	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TKE Engineering 2035 Chicago Avenue Riverside, CA 92507 Phone: (951) 680-0440 Email: trenner@tkeengineering.com	\$ 860,000	April 2023

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
Metro Inspection of Structures, Los Angeles, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Inspection of various structures to determine State of Good Repair rating	LACMTA, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012 Stephen Toms, tomss@metro.com, (212) 418-3143	\$ 8,200,000	April 2026
Caltrans On-Call Construction Materials/ Sampling/Testing Services, Various Locations	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Materials Sampling and Testing	California Department of Transportation, District 1, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901, Gina Reiland, gina.reiland@dot.ca.gov, (530)741-4177	\$ 6,100,000	June 2022
Metro (sub to TRC Companies, Inc.) PS20655	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Waste Handling and Environmental related Construction Services	Tom Kefalas One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012 213-992-4887 kefalast@metro.net	\$ 25,000 to date	Ongoing
Comprehensive Material Inspection and Consulting Services, LA, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Materials Testing	LA Unified School District 1240 Naomi Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90021 Greta Galoustian 213-745-1450	\$ 500,000 current +\$3,560,562 to date	3/28/21
LAWA Midfield Satellite Concourse (MSC), Los Angeles World Airport	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geophysical Utility/Obstruction Evaluation	Turner-PCL, A Joint Venture 8250 Westchester Parkway, Los Angeles, CA 90045 Jonatan C. Aguilar (818) 482-0106	\$ 300k+	TBD

jcaguilar@mscjr.com

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
Metro Westside Subway Extension	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geophysical Evaluation	Skanska Traylor Shea 3050 E. Airport Way Long Beach, CA 90806 James Corcoran, P.E. 562-264-2534 jcorcoran@traylor.com	\$ 100K+	Ongoing - TBD
USPS, Nationwide	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Compliance Services	Herbert Hudson 530 Greensmark Dr. Houston, TX 77060-9998 281-875-4003	\$ 400K to \$600K annually	Est 12/2021
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

PROPOSER: _____

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
DOWNTOWN REDMOND LINK EXTENSION PROJECT, SEATTLE, WA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DESIGN QUALITY SERVICES	SOUND TRANSIT JEFF CHOU 401 S. JACKSON ST. SEATTLE, WA 98104 206-398-5000	\$ 579,538	2022
HSR-SAN FRANCISCO TO MERCED, OAKLAND, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QA/QC LEAD	CHSRA MARK ROBINSON 770 L STREET SUITE 620 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 916-669-6634 MARK.ROBINSON@HSR.CA.GOV	\$ 1,058,000	2021
MOUNT VERNON VIADUCT PROJECT, ORANGE, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ASSURANCE; QUALITY OVERSIGHT	SBCTA HENRY STULTZ 1170 W THIRD ST, 2ND FLOOR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410 909-884-8276 HSTULTZ@GOSBCTA.COM	\$ 563,995	2022
LA METRO QMC, LOS ANGELES, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QMO PROJECT OVERSIGHT; ISO 9001:2015 CERTIFICATION	LA METRO CAMELIA DAVIS LOS ANGELES COUNTY METRO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ONE GATEWAY PLAZA LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-2952	\$ 117,115	2026
PUYALLUP STATION ACCESS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, SEATTLE, WA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QA MANAGEMENT; DQMP	SOUND TRANSIT JEFF CHOU 401 S. JACKSON ST. SEATTLE, WA 98104 206-398-5000	\$ 290,000	2022

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
OCTA Orange County Maintenance Facility, Irvine, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering	Gannett Fleming, Inc.* 601 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 3800 Los Angeles, CA 90017-2731 Ms. Mrika Simoni msimoni@GFnet.com 213-624-0347	\$ 239,300 (est.)	2021 (est.)
Metro C Line (Green) Extension, Los Angeles County, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering	STV * 1055 West Seventh Street, Suite 3150 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Mr. Tyler Bonstead, PE, Vice President tyler.bonstead@stvinc.com 213-247-6838	\$ 818,000 (est.)	2022 (est.)
Caltrans D-12 Pavement Rehab PS&E, Orange County, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Engineering	Caltrans District 12 3347 Michelson Drive, Suite 380 Irvine, CA 92612 Mr. David Lam david.lam@dot.ca.gov 657-328-6080	\$ 462,470 (est.)	2022 (est.)
Metro East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor LRT, Los Angeles County, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering	Gannett Fleming, Inc. * 601 S Figueroa Street, Suite 3800 Los Angeles, CA 90017-2731 Mr. Eric Olson, PE eolson@gfnet.com 213-624-0347	\$ 183,400 (to date)	2023 (est.)
POLB Pier B On-Dock Rail Support Facility Program, Long Beach, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering	HDR Engineering, Inc. * 100 Oceangate, Suite 1120 Long Beach, CA 90802-4414 Mr. Gary Goldman Gary.Goldman@hdrinc.com 714-730-2320	\$ 522,759 (est.) \$378,600 (to date)	2025 (est.)

* DYA Client

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
California HSR-Burbank to Los Angeles and Los Angeles to Anaheim, Los Angeles and Orange Counties, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>GPA is preparing Section 4(f) Evaluations and historic resources studies.</p>	<p>Owner: California HSR Authority; Prime Contact: Doreen Zhao, AICP, Urban Planner, STV; 1055 West Seventh Street, Suite 2900, Los Angeles, CA 90017-2556; (213) 236-2539; Doreen.Zhao@stvinc.com</p>	\$ 651,621	2021
I-605 Corridor Improvement, Los Angeles County, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>GPA is leading the EIR/EIS process and providing oversight of environmental technical studies.</p>	<p>Owner and Contact: Metro, One Gateway Plaza, LA, CA 90012; Isidro Panuco; panucoi@metro.net; (213) 418-3208</p>	\$ 5,342,118	2021
Eastbound SR-91/ Atlantic Avenue to Cherry Avenue Auxiliary Lane Improvement, Los Angeles County, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>GPA is preparing an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment.</p>	<p>Owner: Metro, One Gateway Plaza, LA, CA 90012; Prime Contact: Camilo Rocha, TRC Solutions; 17911 Von Karman Ave., Ste. 400, Irvine, CA 92614; crocha@trcsolutions.com; (949) 727-7304</p>	\$ 315,032	2021
I-605/Valley Boulevard Interchange Improvements, Los Angeles County, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>GPA is preparing an IS/EA, NES, and Section 106 reports. GPA is also managing the preparation of archaeology, hazardous material, air quality, and noise studies.</p>	<p>Owner: Metro, One Gateway Plaza, LA, CA 90012; Prime Contact: Michael Crull, NCM; 8525 Gibbs Drive, Ste. 202, San Diego, CA 92123; michael.crull@ncmcivil.com; (858) 283-0330</p>	\$ 107,131	2021
Rice Avenue at Fifth Street Grade Separation PS&E, Oxnard, CA	<p>Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>GPA is conducting environmental services associated with the PS&E phase: NEPA revalidation, review of design plans and construction specifications, tracking the ECR</p>	<p>Owner: City of Oxnard, 300 W. Third St., Oxnard, CA 93030; Prime Contact: Carlos Cadena, WKE, Inc.; 400 N. Tustin Avenue, Ste. 275, Santa Ana, CA 92705; (714) 953-1003; ccadena@wke-inc.com</p>	\$ 109,261	2022

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
Mount Vernon Viaduct - San Bernardino CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Creating and maintain a fully cost and resource loaded Program PCM schedule on this Design-Build Project. Review of proposal schedules for reasonableness, innovations, constructability concerns and risk issues.	SBCTA, 949-988-1616, Tom Densford,tdensford@biggsca rdosa.com	\$ 250,000	Summer 2023
High Speed Rail - Bakersfield / Fresno CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development and maintenance of a fully cost and resource loaded schedule for this roughly \$600M Design-Build Project. Third party engagement and management, along with extensive administrative, permitting, and approvals	California Rail Builders, 661-431-9133, Antonio Canete,acanete@ferrovial.us	\$ 1,500,000	Fall 2021
Sound Transit - Seattle WA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Providing estimating services to Sound Transit.	Sound Transit, 503-548-8998, Claire Turpel Chase,claire.chase@soundtransit.org	\$ TBD	March 2021
IEUA Program Controls - Chino CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Full time project controls services, as needed delay claims management, and as needed estimating and forensic cost estimating	IEUA Rachael Solis, 909-993-1895 rsolis@ieua.org	\$ 1,000,000	Fall 2022
Ontario Program Controls - Ontario CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Capital Project Control Systems Integration and Support Services	City of Ontario Dennis Mejia, 909-395-2618 dmejia@ontarioca.gov	\$ 100,000	Fall 2022

PROPOSER: _____

LIST OF CURRENT PROJECTS (BACKLOG)

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version: http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ESTIMATED COST OF BIDDER'S WORK	ESTIMATED COMPLETION
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

BIDDER/PROPOSER: _____

EXHIBIT 6 - LIST OF CURRENT CONTRACTS - BACKLOG

CONTRACT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK/SERVICES	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, CONTACT PERSON, EMAIL ADDRESS, PHONE NO.	ESTIMATED VALUE OF BIDDER'S / PROPOSER'S WORK/SERVICES	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
Firestone Bridge Widening, South Gate, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Provided construction management for the widening of the bridge and several new retaining walls.	City of South Gate 8650 California Ave., South Gate, CA 90280 Elias Saiklay, e saiklay@sogate.org 323.563.563.9581	\$ 1.3 Million	2016-2017
Five Point Gateway – Marine Way Plaza Bridge, formerly OCPC Broadcom Campus	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided structural representation and inspection services for the bridges and retaining walls.	DPR Construction 25 Calle Portofino, San Clemente, CA 92673 Nick Whitaker, (now an independent Consultant) nwhitaker@gmail.com 949.531.3638	\$ 500,000	2016-2018
Firestone Blvd. Regional Corridor Capacity Enhancements. South Gate, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Provided construction management and inspection services for the boulevard and soundwall	City of South Gate 415 W. Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90802 Clint Herrera (now with Port of Long Beach), clint.herrera@polb.com, 562.283.7874	\$ 1.8 Million	2017-2019
Central Avenue Project, Phase I Montclair, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Provided construction management and inspection services for the rehabilitation of Central Avenue, between Phillips Boulevard and I-10	City of Norwalk 17011 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach, CA 92647 Bill Zimmerman, wgzimmerman@wgze.com, 714.412.1597	\$ 1.1 Million	2018-2020
North Spring Street Bridge, Los Angeles, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided structures construction support, structural representative and bridge inspections for the widening and rehabilitation of the bridge	City of Los Angeles 1149 South Broadway, Ste. 750, Los Angeles, CA 90015 Scott Gibson scott.gibson@lacity.com 213.485.4495	\$ 415,000	2015-2018

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS
 (Click here for the pdf with form fields version [http://media.metro.net/ebb/
 contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf](http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf))

Include only contracts that are pertinent for this Invitation for Bid/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work/Services.

CONTRACT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK/SERVICES	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, CONTACT PERSON, EMAIL ADDRESS, PHONE NO.	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT DATE AND DURATION
I-215 Newport Road Interchange Widening Menifee, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description: Construction Management Services	RCTD, 2950 Washington Street, Riverside, CA 92504 Cindi Wachi cwachi@rivco.org 951-955-1863	\$42M	07/2014 - 04/2018
Bayshore Bikeway Segments 4B and 5 San Diego, C	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description: Construction Management Services	SANDAG 401 B Street, San Diego, CA 92101 John Anderson john.anderson@sandag.org 619-699-7342	\$1.8M	12/2016 - 09/2018
Lenwood Road Grade Separation Barstow, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Description: Construction Management Services	SBCTA, 1170 W 3rd St, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92410 Mike Barnum mbarnum@gosbcta.com 909-884-8276	\$24M	08/2013 - 12/2018
Monte Vista Road Grade Separation Project Montclair, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Description: Construction Management Services	SBCTA, 1170 W 3rd St, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92410 Henry Stultz hstultz@gosbcta.com 951-901-0023	\$26.7M	05/2017 - 12/2018
On-Call Construction Claims Support Districts 5, 6, 9 and 10 Fresno, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description: Construction Management Services	Caltrans, 2015 E. Shields Ave, Suite 100 Fresno, CA 93726 Diana Gong diana.gong@dot.ca.gov 559-243-3423	\$1.1M	08/2013 - 08/2018

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
D59/5 Structures Construction Inspection On-Call Caltrans Districts 5 and 59	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>	Neil Weller, Senior Bridge Engineer 50 Higuera Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 805.471.2109 neil.weller@dot.ca.gov	\$ 4M	3/6/2015 - 9/30/2018
Golden Valley Road Interchange at State Route 14, City of Santa Clarita	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Newman, PE, PLS Director of Public Works 23920 Valencia Blvd., Ste. 300 Santa Clarita, CA 91355 661.510.0111 rnewman@santa-clarita.com	\$ 1.2M	2014 - 2018
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
SCRRA/Metrolink SCORE Program - Marengo Siding Extension San Bernardino, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design Engineering	SCRRA/Metrolink c/o STV/Jacobs JV 1055 W. Seventh St., Ste. 3150 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Mr. Andrew Sokol, STV Vice President Email: Andrew.sokol@stvinc.com Tel: (213) 430-0584	\$ 300K	2018-2020
LA Metro - North San Fernando Valley BRT Corridor Mapping San Fernando Valley, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aerial Mapping	LA Metro c/o IBI Group 315 West 9th St., Ste. 600 Los Angeles, CA 90015 Mr. David Chow, PE Email: dchow@ibigroup.com Tel: (213) 769-0011	\$ 200K	2019-2020
LA Metro - Foothill Gold Line Phase 2B - California Ave Grade Separation Pasadena, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Track Alignment, Constructability and Cost Verification Services	Metro Gold Line Foothill Ext. Construction Authority c/o Hill International, Inc. 100 Spectrum Center Drive, Suite 550 Irvine, CA 92618 Mr. Chris Burner Email: CBurner@foothillgoldline.org Tel: (626) 590-7498	\$ 20K	2020
UPRR - Mainline Relocation & Emergency Mapping Niland, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Aerial Mapping	UPRR 1400 Douglas Street Omaha, NE 68179 Mr. Ken Freimuth, Special Projects Email: kafreimu@up.com Tel: (402) 544-5167	\$ 20K	2018
BNSF Railway - Rosecrans/Marquardt Grade Crossing Santa Fe Springs, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Design Exhibits, CPUC Application, Traffic Study	BNSF Railway 740 E Carnegie Drive San Bernardino, CA 92408 Mr. Jason Sanchez Email: Jason.Sanchez@bnsf.com Tel: (909) 386-4470	\$ 60K	2018

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
SR120/Union Road Manteca	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewing and assessing contractor submittals, DSDC, signage, and traffic flow	Rob Shackelford Dewberry Drake Haglan 925 808-9927 RShackelford@Dewberry.com	\$ 50,000	March 2019 to Jan 2021
City of Concord On-Call 2018	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> General engineering support and signal timing/SCATS and traffic operations	Virendra Patel City of Concord 1950 Parkside Drive, MS/40 Concord, CA 925.330.0141 Virendra.patel@cityofconcord.org	\$ 450,000	2014-present
San Rafael ATSPM	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>	Rafat Raie 1400 5th Ave, San Rafael, CA rafat.raie@cityofsanrafael.org 415 485-3473	\$ 167,000	August 2018-January 2021
Mountain House CSD On-Call Transportation Engineering	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>	Nader Shareghi 230 S Sterling Dr, Mountain House, CA 209.831.2300 nshareghi@sjgov.org	\$ 450,000	2002-present
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
On-Call Quality Assurance/Independent Quality Assurance Services, Statewide, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> QA and IQA services for 600+ projects in CA	California Department of Transportation, 1801 30th Street, 5th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95816, (916) 227-0387, Yongxin Liu, yongxin.liu@dot.ca.gov	\$ 30,190,000	May 2016 to November 2018
California High Speed Rail, Statewide, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quality, contract and program management	California High Speed Rail Authority, 770 L Street, Suite 800, Sacramento, CA 95814, (530) 681-6658, Mark Robinson, mark.robinson@hsr.ca.gov	\$ 12,285,000.00	April 2015 to April 2018
Union/Patsaouras Plaza Busway Station Design-Build Project, Los Angeles, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verification inspection and testing, materials testing, lab testing, specialty inspections	Metro, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012 Kofi Baryeh, baryehk@metro.net, (213) 922-7551	\$ 640,000	December 2019
On-Call Materials Sampling & Testing Services, North Bay, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Materials sampling and testing	Caltrans District 4, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612, Catalino Nicolas, catalino.nicolas@dot.ca.gov, (510)286-7188	\$ 5,000,000	December 2019
Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement Project, Various Locations	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Independent quality assurance, materials testing, plant inspection	California Department of Transportation, 1801 30th Street, Sacramento, CA 95816, Yongxin Liu, yongxin.liu@dot.ca.gov, (916) 227-0387	\$ 1,750,000	May 2020

227-0387

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
El Segundo Refinery Compliance - Ladder Safety, El Segundo, CA	Prime <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Special Inspections, Survey of exterior fixed ladders, cages, wells and swing gates; evaluate compliance with the Federal OSHA Final Rule	Chevron Products Company Andwele Cooper, Designs Engineer El Segundo Refinery 324 W. El Segundo Boulevard El Segundo, CA 90245 AndweleCooper@chevron.com	\$ 45,156.46	12/18 - 9/19
Westside Purple Line Subway Extension Los Angeles, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Surface and subsurface studies for assessment of abandoned oil wells	Skansa Taylor Shea-JV James Corcoran 3050 E. Airport Way Long Beach, CA 90806 526-264-2534; jcorcoran@traylor.com	\$ 92,290	9/18 - 4/20
Interstate 605 & State Rte 91 Interchange Project LA County, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Construction Inspection/Testing; Geotechnical Investigation	Michael Baker International Eric Spangler Hutton Center Dr. #500 Santa Ana, CA 92707 949-855-3657; eric.spangler@mbakerintl.com	\$ 62,746	10/16 - 2/18
Melrose Ave. Complete Street Project Hollywood, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Construction Inspection/Testing; Geotechnical Investigation	Kabbara Engineering Leah Kabbara 121 North Harwood St. Orange, CA 92866 714-744-9771; lea@kabbara.net	\$ 20,750	6/18 - 8/19
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

PROPOSER: _____

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
BART Silicon Valley Phase 2, San Jose, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owner's QA Oversight	VTA Krishna Davey 3331 N. First Street San Jose, CA 95134 408-942-6124 krishna.davey@vta.org	\$ 88M PM NSI \$1.8M	2017-2020
California High Speed Train Project: CP4, Wasco, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QA Management	CHSRA Mark Robinson 770 L Street, Suite 620 Sacramento, CA 95814 916-669-6564 mark.robinson@hsr.ca.gov	\$ 30M CM	2016-2019
Lone Hill to CP White Double Track, Los Angeles, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QA Management	LAMETRO Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952 Jay Fuhman 213-922-2810 fuhmanj@metro.net	\$ 70M NSI \$58k	2015-2018
BART Train Control Modernization Project, Oakland, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QA Management	BART Tom Dunscombe 300 Lakeside Drive, 23rd Floor, Oakland, California 94612 510-287-4822 tdunscombe@bart.gov	\$ 800M NSI \$1.8M	2015-2020
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
OCTA OC Streetcar Project, Santa Ana, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering	Orange County Transportation Authority 550 S. Main Street Orange, CA 92863 Mr. William Farthing, PE bfarthing@octa.net 714-560-5813	\$ 1,183,700 (project to date)	Substantially Complete December 2015 to Present
RCTC I-15 Express Lanes Design-Build Corona & Norco, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering	AZTEC Engineering Group, Inc. * 1231 E. Dyer Road, Suite 250 Santa Ana, CA 92705 Mr. Scott McKensie, PE Executive Vice President smckenzie@aztec.us 602-509-8895	\$ 3,710,000 (project to date)	August 2016 to September 2020
MWD Diemer Filtration Plant CIDH Construction Observation Yorba Linda, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Construction Observation	Kaveh Engineering & Construction, Inc. * 22600 Savi Ranch Parkway, Suite A14 Yorba Linda, CA 92887 Mr. Fred Bashardoost, PE fred@kavehinc.com 714-793-6655	\$ 77,000	July 2018 to October 2018
Metro Eastside Transit Corridor, Phase II, Los Angeles County, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering	Cordoba Corporation * 1401 N. Broadway Los Angeles, CA, 90012 Ms. Melissa de la Peña, PE mdelapena@cordobacorp.com 213-895-0224	\$612,000	February 2019 to October 2020 (substantially complete)
LAWA C-14 Deluge System Construction Support Los Angeles, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Construction Support	HNTB * 6033 West Century Boulevard, Suite 1050 Los Angeles, CA 90045 Mr. Tony Fermelia, PE tfermelia@hntb.com 310-846-1810	\$ 28,100	July 2020 to January 2021

* DYA Client

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Study, Van Nuys, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPA wrote sections of the Draft EIR/EIS, and is currently preparing historic documentation. GPA may assist with response to comments and the Final EIR/EIS.	Owner: Metro, One Gateway Plaza, LA, CA 90012; Prime Contact: Joel Falter, COO, KOA Corporation; 1100 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 201, Monterey Park, CA 91754; (323) 260-4703; jfalter@koacorp.com	\$ 295,425	2011-2020
Rosecrans / Marquardt Grade Separation, Santa Fe, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPA prepared the PES, scoping summary report, and EA.	Owner: Metro, One Gateway Plaza, LA, CA 90012; Prime Contact: Michael Thomas, BCA; 600 S. Main St., Ste. 900, Orange, CA 92868; (714) 550-4665; mthomas@biggscardosa.com	\$ 270,340	2015-2019
Rice Avenue Grade Separation, Oxnard, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPA managed the entire environmental process, from preparation of the Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report through the Final EIR/EA.	Owner: City of Oxnard, 300 W. Third St., Oxnard, CA 93030; Prime Contact: Carlos Cadena, WKE, Inc.; 400 N. Tustin Avenue, Ste. 275, Santa Ana, CA 92705; (714) 953-1003; ccadena@wke-inc.com	\$ 310,630	2015-2018
I-605/SR-91 Interchange Improvements, Los Angeles County, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPA assisted Metro during the PA/ED phase as well as environmental scoping and community outreach.	Owner: Metro, One Gateway Plaza, LA, CA 90012; Isidro Panuco; (213) 418-3208; panucoi@metro.net	\$ 316,866	2016-2019
North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit, Los Angeles County, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPA prepared a Biological Survey Report and a Historic Resource Technical Report.	Owner: Metro, One Gateway Plaza, LA, CA 90012; Prime Contact: Greg Kyle, AICP, Senior Vice President, Kimley-Horn; (213) 261-4109; greg.kyle@kimley-horn.com	\$ 130,971	2018-2020

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.

PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
LAX LULEP - Los Angeles CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsible for managing over 30 projects starting from design, construction baselines through to substantial completion. Claims management and time impact analysis throughout the duration of the program.	LAWA, 5200 W. Century Blvd., Suite 350 Los Angeles, CA 90045, (424) 227-3277, Micaiah Revero, MRevero@myers-sons.com	\$ 2,144,800	June 2020
OC405 - Orange County CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performed project scheduling, estimating, change order management and cost analyst with bid software Bid2Win and scheduling software Primavera P6.	OCTA, 550 S. Main Street, Orange, CA 92868, Abraham Wahed, w.abrhim@oc405.com	\$ 305,000	April 2018
I66 Virginia Department of Transportation	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provided project controls, CPM scheduling.	Virginia DOT, 1401 E. Broad St., Richmond, Virginia 23219, 512-637-8591, Tim Glass, tglass@ferrovial.us	\$ 340,400	July 2019
Houston Grand Parkway - Houston Texas	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Controls, CPM scheduling services	Texas DOT, 125 East 11th St. Austin, TX 78701, 512-637-8591, Tim Glass, tglass@ferrovial.us	\$ 40,000	May 2018
Soundwall Package 11 - Burbank, CA	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scheduling support for aspects of the project pertaining to bridges, retaining walls, ramps, shoulder work, and paving.	LACMTA, One Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012, (909) 356-8880, Mike Powell, mike@powellconstructors.com	\$ 15,000	December 2019

PROPOSER: _____

LIST OF COMPLETED PROJECTS - LAST THREE YEARS

(Click here for the pdf with form fields version http://media.metro.net/ebb/contract_templates/5-005_054_and_055_List_of_Curr_and_Comp_Proj_%28Backlog%29.pdf)

Include only projects that are pertinent for this Invitation For Bids/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work.


PROJECT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NO. CONTACT PERSON EMAIL ADDRESS	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	DATE CONTRACT DURATION
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/>		\$	

EXHIBIT 7 - LIST OF COMPLETED CONTRACTS - LAST FIVE (5) YEARS

Include only contracts that are pertinent for this Invitation for Bid/Request for Proposal, in order to demonstrate Bidder's/Proposer's ability to perform the required Work/Services.

CONTRACT NAME AND LOCATION	DESCRIPTION OF WORK/SERVICES	OWNER'S NAME, ADDRESS, CONTACT PERSON, EMAIL ADDRESS, PHONE NO.	ACTUAL FINAL CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT DATE AND DURATION
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	
	Prime <input type="checkbox"/> Sub <input type="checkbox"/> Description:		\$	

7. EXPERIENCE / PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES



Metro Orange Line Sepulveda Station



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Biggs Cardosa Associates, Inc.
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Jim Costantini, Deputy Director
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Valley Transportation Authority
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 3331 North First Street, Bldg. A
Physical / Mailing Address
San Jose CA USA 95134
City State Country Zip Code
4. 408.321.5661 408.813.1466 james.costantini@vta.org
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm

Biggs Cardosa was the line segment structures lead for the SVBX Project. The project consisted of Preliminary and some Final Design for approximately 40 Line Segment Structures (BART bridges, UPRR bridges, Station Guideways, Roadway bridges over BART) and associated ancillary facilities along the 10-mile BART Extension.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Having worked with the firm for over 25 years, with no issues, I would not hesitate
to work Biggs Cardosa Associates again. I appreciate that they always look for
improvement, and understand the importance of implementing value
engineering at the very start of the project and not at the end when it becomes
more costly to implement. Always do an excellent job!


To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16



Past Experience/Performance Team Member

2/24/2021

Date



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Biggs Cardosa Associates, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Dan Mahgerefteh, Director of Engineering (Regional Rail)
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- One Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles CA USA 90012
City State Country Zip Code
- 213.418.3219 213.278.9485 MahgereftehD@metro.net
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Biggs Cardosa (BCA) is the prime consultant providing project management and structural engineering services for the design of a grade separation of the intersection of Rosecrans and Marquardt Avenues and the BNSF Railway. BCA is responsible for the design of the Rosecrans Avenue Overpass and retaining walls, and oversees all design components including civil/roadway, utilities, drainage, traffic, geotechnical, survey, right-of-way engineering, and others.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Biggs Cardosa's work and knowledge has been very satisfactory for the project.

They have been very well-organized, and their technical knowledge, skills and experience has been very beneficial for the project.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review **Score**
16


Past Experience/Performance Team Member

3/16/2021
Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Biggs Cardosa Associates, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. William Zimmerman, (Ex-City Engineer)
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. City of Norwalk
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 17011 Beach Boulevard, Ste. 1240
Physical / Mailing Address
Huntington Beach CA USA 92647
City State Country Zip Code
4. 657.845.9500 Cell: 714.412.1597 wgzimmerman@wgze.com
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Provided construction management and inspection services for the replacement of the Firestone Boulevard Bridge over the San Gabriel River, located in Norwalk, CA. Project constituted of a bridge replacement, several retaining wall construction and street improvements. Biggs Cardosa was responsible for implementing the quality assurance plan and protocols per FHWA funding requirements under Caltrans Oversight.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Yes, the City hired the Consultant for other City projects.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Score

16

Proposer's status after review


Past Experience/Performance Team Member

March 10, 2021

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Anser Advisory Management, LLC
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Divyesh Vora, Chief, Quality Assurance and Source Inspections, LA, METS CALTRANS
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. California Department of Transportation, Materials Engineering and Testing Services
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 13230 E. Firestone Blvd, Unit D
Physical / Mailing Address
Santa Fe Springs CA USA 90670
City State Country Zip Code
4. 562-677-6485 divyesh.vora@dot.ca.gov
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. **Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**
Quality assurance and contract administration services for construction of expresslanes on the 110 and 10.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Mr. Miramontes has excellent qualification and education background in construction

administration of transportation projects. He has always worked towards partnering and

fairness for all stakeholders. Highly recommend this firm and individual.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

3/1/2021

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Anser Advisory Management, LLC
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Alice Hsu, Director of Engineering, Program
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 1 Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles, CA, 90012
City State Country Zip Code
213-418-3113
4. Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Anser is providing construction management supplemental service for the
Division 20 Portal Widening Turnback Project.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Metro appreciates the open line of communication and expertise of Anser

Advisory staff. They have a level of professionalism that is unprecedented.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Alice Han

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

15/16

2/22/21

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Anser Advisory Management, LLC
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Ward Maxwell, PE Riverside County Transportation Department Construction Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Anser Advisory Management, LLC
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 2950 Washington Street
Physical / Mailing Address
Riverside, CA 92504
City State Country Zip Code
4. Phone (951) 955-8614 Cell (951) 346-6335 wmaxwell@rivco.org
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. **Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**
Construction Management of Avenue 66 Grade Separation Project (\$33M Construction Value) in Mecca CA



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Anser has consistently been working on County CIP projects since 2014. They are also a selected
consultant for the County on-call. They are a trusted consultant and would contract with them in
the future.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

16

03/11/21

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 6-29
of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

MNS Engineers, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Andy Gill, PE Senior Bridge Engineer
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Caltrans, Office of Structures Construction
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 35 S. La Patera Lane, Suite E
Physical / Mailing Address
Goleta CA Santa Barbara 93117
City State Country Zip Code
4. 805 692 6832 805 705 1201 andy.gill@dot.ca.gov
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. **Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**
Providing On-Call Construction Engineering and Inspection services to Caltrans for Structures projects in District 5 region



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/ A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

~~Caltrans' contract with MNS is for Construction Inspection and Engineering during construction phase. I'm pleased with the MNS contract manager, Greg Chelini and the staff has provided. He understands ours need and strives to provide staff that with matching skills and experience. Several of the questions above are outside scope of our current contract with MNS, so I rated those items as N/A. Thank you.~~

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

16

2/16/2021

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 6-29
of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

MNS Engineers, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Kelly Fisher, Public Works Project Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. City of Agoura Hills
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 30001 Ladyface Court
Physical / Mailing Address
Agoura Hills CA Los Angeles 91301
City State Country Zip Code
4. (818) 597-7338 kfisher@agourahillscity.org
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Construction Management on US 101/Palo Comado Canyon Road Interchange



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail				Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

PLEASE NOTE THE PALO COMADO INTERCHANGE IS

STILL UNDER CONSTRUCTION. NO CLAIMS HAVE

BEEN SUBMITTED TO DATE.

THE CITY HAS HIRED MNS TO PROVIDE CM SERVICES

FOR AN UPCOMING BRIDGE PROJECT.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16

Kelly Fisher
Past Experience/Performance Team Member

2-16-21

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 6-29
of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

MNS Engineers, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Mike Hennawy PE, City Engineer
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. City of Santa Clarita
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 23920 Valencia Boulevard
Physical / Mailing Address
Santa Clarita CA Los Angeles 91355
City State Country Zip Code
4. (661) 286-4056 mhennawy@santa-clarita.com
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Construction Management on I-14/ Golden Valley Road Bridge Widening, Newhall Ranch
Road Bridge Widening



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

MNS has provided the City with Construction Management and Inspection services on several _____

bridge and roadway improvement projects. They have provided experienced and knowledgeable _____

staff to successfully manage these projects. The City would certainly contract with MNS on _____

future construction projects and would recommend them to Metro. _____

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16



Past Experience/Performance Team Member

2-17-2021

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Zephyr UAS, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

Performance Evaluation for Jacqueline Patterson and Zephyr UAS team

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Mr. Aaron Franklin, Senior Manager, Quality Assurance/Compliance
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro)
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- One Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles CA USA 90012
City State Country Zip Code
- 213-922-1317 FranklinA@metro.net
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Zephyr UAS, Inc is providing Construction Management Services for LA Metro's
Division 20 Portal Widening & Turnback Facility Project in Downtown LA.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail				Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Zephyr UAS as part of the Division 20 Portal Widening and Turnback project has performed exceptionally well.

Resident Engineers, Inspectors and other Construction Support Staff employed under Zephyr, have been professional and dedicated to assisting Metro in delivering a successful project.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
<u>Aaron C. Franklin - Senior Manager Quality Assurance/Compliance</u>	<u>02/10/2021</u>
Past Experience/Performance Team Member	Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Zephyr UAS, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

Performance Evaluation for Jacqueline Patterson and Zephyr UAS team

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Mr. Dave Sanders, Senior Safety Specialist - Construction
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro)
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- One Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles CA USA 90012
City State Country Zip Code
- 213-210-7034 SandersDa@metro.net
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Zephyr UAS, Inc is providing Construction Management Services for LA Metro's
Division 20 Portal Widening & Turnback Facility Project in Downtown LA.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF **NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY** CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE **MEETS** CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY **MEETS** CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY **EXCEEDS** CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail				Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

**FORM V1.0
PS70129**

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Consultant is very Professional and works as a Team with Metro Staff. Consultant stays on top of the project and set time reviews for sustainability Rf's, Rf's to ensure Metro is always ahead of contractual timelines. Consultant safety is top priority and works with contractor to ensure contract compliance is maintained at all times.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16

David W Sanders
Past Experience/Performance Team Member

2-11-2024
Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Zephyr UAS, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

Performance Evaluation for Jacqueline Patterson and Zephyr UAS team

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Mrs. June Susilo, Deputy Executive Officer - Program Management
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro)
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- One Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles CA USA 90012
City State Country Zip Code
- 562-524-0532 SusiloJ@metro.net
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Zephyr UAS, Inc is providing Construction Management Services for LA Metro's
Division 20 Portal Widening & Turnback Facility Project in Downtown LA.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail				Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Jackie Patterson and her team at Zephyr are professional, organized, competent, responsive, and exceed Metro's expectations on supporting the project. Innovative, cooperative, and a team player. As a project manager in Program Management I would not hesitate to contract with Ms. Patterson and her firm on future contracts.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
<u><i>June Anisib</i></u>	<u>02/22/2021</u>
Past Experience/Performance Team Member	Date



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Advanced Mobility Group (Sub-consultant to Biggs Cardosa and Associates Inc.)

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Virendra Patel, Transportation Program Manager

Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative

2. City of Concord

Exact Name of Responding Firm

3. 1950 Parkside Drive

Physical / Mailing Address

Concord

CA

94519

City

State

Country

Zip Code

4. 925.330.0141

Primary / Main Telephone No.

virendra.patel@cityofconcord.org

Alt. Telephone No.

Email

5. **Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**

The AMG team has provided services on various projects in the City of Concord. Activities include: Signal Timing & Traffic Operations - AMG staff is assisting with the development of signal timing plans, including the signal operations updates for the City, which operates on ATMS now. AMG provides advanced ITS solutions for the City, including fiber design, signal upgrades, wireless communication, Smart City solutions, and other. Additional services include general engineering, Construction support and inspection, staff augmentation; grant writing; and community outreach.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

AMG has been our On Call consultant for all transportation engineering design and

construction management work. We extended their contract for additional 3 years.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16

2/17/2021

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Date



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Advanced Mobility Group (Sub-consultant to Biggs Cardosa and Associates Inc.)

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Nader Shareghi, Director of Public Works
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Mountain House Community Services District
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 251 E. Main Street
Physical / Mailing Address
Mountain House CA 95391
City State Country Zip Code
4. 209.831.2300 nshareghi@sjgov.org
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
The AMG team has provided services on various projects in Mountain House since its inception more than a decade ago, including: Signal Triggering and Monitoring Study, Construction Support, Plan Check – Joint Trench/Signing-Striping/Lighting/Signal Design, Signal installation and inspection, Fiber Optic installation assistance and testing, Fiber Master Plan review, Bid document review and approval.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail				Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

We would definitely contract with AMG again, since we are extremely satisfied with

their service.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Nader Sharegh
Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

16

2/19/21

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0

Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Advanced Mobility Group (Sub-consultant to Biggs Cardosa and Associates Inc.)

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Rob Shackelford, Construction Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Dewberry/Drake Haglan, Prime Consultant
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 11060 White Rock Road, Suite 200
Physical / Mailing Address

Rancho Cordova	CA		95670
City	State	Country	Zip Code
4. 925.808.9927
Primary / Main Telephone No. RShackelford@Dewberry.com
Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
SR120/Union Road Interchange Project: AMG provided on-site and remote support for on-going construction of a diverging diamond interchange in the City of Manteca. AMG was responsible for reviewing and assessing contractor submittals, design changes throughout construction, construction area signage, and traffic flows throughout the project area. During the project, traffic impacts due to construction activity were addressed with crucial coordination between AMG and the City, Caltrans, contractor, and designer resulting in minimal disruption to the local population. Project construction was completed in early 2021.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

We include AMG on our team for multiple projects that requires Traffic/ITS services

during the construction phase.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Rob Szyl
Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

16

2/22/21
Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Atlas Technical Consultants

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Brad Wines, Project Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Balfour Beatty
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 1501 Quail Street, Suite 130
Physical / Mailing Address
Newport Beach CA USA 92660
City State Country Zip Code
4. 949-357-2055 N/A
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Atlas Technical Consultants performed field inspection, soils testing, and other laboratory testing services for the City of Bellflower Transit Station and Parking Lot project.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

This was the first time I've had the Owner request the testing laboratory be under contract with

us as the General Contractor. Atlas worked seamlessly with us and helped to maintain our budget.

They were very helpful in working through some soil issues we had and provided options for us

and the owner to review. I highly recommend Atlas.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>15/16</u>
<u>Brad Wines</u> <i>Brad Wines</i>	<u>2/23/2021</u>
Past Experience/Performance Team Member	Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Alta Vista Solutions, an Atlas Company
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Karen Keal, Project Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- 585 S Santa Fe Ave
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles CA USA 90012
City State Country Zip Code
- (213) 694-4281 karen.keal@lacity.org
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**
Source inspection of material more than 30 miles outside of City of Los Angeles limits,
materials testing, facility audits, structural materials representation support.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority


Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

I would contract with Alta Vista Solutions again as they have provided great value and expertise
to our project for the past few years and continue to do so.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review



Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

16

2/21/2021

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.D
PS70129

Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Alta Vista performed all necessarily QA duties and in a timely manner.

Two PM transitions occurred during the Contract and qualified replacement

was provided in a timely manner.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16



Past Experience/Performance Team Member

2/18/21

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Pacifica Services, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Rueben Smith Vice Chancellor & Chief Facilities Executive

Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative

2. Los angeles Community College District (LACCD)

Exact Name of Responding Firm

3. 770 Wishire Blvd 6th Floor

Physical / Mailing Address

Los Angeles

CA

USA

90017

City

State

Country

Zip Code

4. 213.891.2048

626.423.2048 smithrc@laccd.edu

Primary / Main Telephone No.

Alt. Telephone No.

Email

5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm

BuildLACCD Bond capital construction program. \$9.6B school construction renovation building program.

Also responsible for real estate, facilities, planning and development for the entire LACCD District.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Overall exceptional service and quality work.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review


Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score
E 16
3-2-21
Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Pacifica Services, Inc.

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. James Cohen EO/PM WPLE Section 1
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Metro
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 5055 Wilshire Blvd Suite 400
Physical / Mailing Address
LA CA USA 90036
City State Country Zip Code
4. 323.900.2114 Cohenja @metro.net
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm

Provided staff augmentation to the WPLE Section 1 Project. Please note that the responses to the questions raised below are related to only the staff provided to the Project.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of
-

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U - UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S - SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G - GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E - EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail				Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority


Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Staff provided to the Project was well qualified and
performed the required tasks in a timely manner
and with good quality.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.


Proposer's status after review



Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

16


Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Pacifica Services, Inc.
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Andy Plumley, Former Assistant Chancellor
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. University of California, Riverside
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 3595 Canyon Crest Dr.
Physical / Mailing Address
Riverside CA United States 92521
City State Country Zip Code
4. (951) 827-7711 andy.plumley@ucr.edu
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. **Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**
Construction Management Services



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16

Andy Plumley, Former Assistant Chancellor

2/22/2021

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Date



Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE MTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMAMCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE REPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSED (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

MARRS Services, Inc., 340 E. Commonwealth Ave., Fullerton, CA 92832
P: 714.213.8650 | F: 714.213.8657

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Pedro Garcia, P.E., CCM, Civil Engineer, PM 1
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- 1149 S. Broadway, Suite 120
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2213
City State Country Zip Code
- P: (213) 847-0472 / C: 818-314-2402 Primary / Main Telephone No. pedro.garcia@lacity.org Primary / Main Fax No.
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding Firm
Contract No. C-115229 - Task B Potrero Canyon Remediation and Park Development Project Design and Construction Support Services. Project involves grading of about 30 acres of the Canyon to create about 8 acres of wetlands to re-establish riparian habitat, create ADA compliant trails and walkways for active park experience, provide landscaping and irrigation for the entire 30 acres. Support facilities include low impact development parking area, public washroom and lift station to capture and recycle dry weather drainage for the County of Los Angeles Environmental Compliance requirements.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF **NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER.** AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE **MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS.** AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE **CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS.** AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE **CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS.** AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution to design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedure(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Riaz is very responsive and helpful, and his experience and effort in coordinating the work of various sub-consultants was paramount to the successful completion of phase 1 of the project.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

(Note: The Technical Evaluation Team may determine any unsatisfactory identified as critical to the procurement)

Proposer's status after review Score
14


Past Experience/Performance Team Member

12/2/20
Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE MTA IN ITS ASSESMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMAMCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE REPSONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSED (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

MARRS Services, Inc., 340 E. Commonwealth Ave., Fullerton, CA 92832
P: 714.213.8650 | F: 714.213.8657

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

Blank lines for additional information.

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Robert L. Gilbert, Chief Development Officer - (Retired 06/2020, new contact info provided below)
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative

2. Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA)
Exact Name of Responding Firm
7301 World Way West, 10th Floor - (Retired 06/2020)

3. Current address: 9709 Portofino Drive, Orlando, FL 32832
Physical / Mailing Address

Los Angeles, CA 90045
City State Country Zip Code

4. Current Phone No.: (571) 263-2533 Current email: BG73@msn.com
Primary / Main Telephone No. Primary / Main Fax No.

5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding Firm
Contract No. C-115229 - Task B Potrero Canyon Remediation and Park Development Project Design and Construction Support Services. Project involves grading of about 30 acres of the Canyon to create about 8 acres of wetlands to re-establish riparian habitat, create ADA compliant trails and walkways for active park experience, provide landscaping and irrigation for the entire 30 acres. Support facilities include low impact development parking area, public washroom and lift station to capture and recycle dry weather drainage for the County of Los Angeles Environmental Compliance requirements.

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U - UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S - SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G - GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E - EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail				Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant?
(Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

I have known MARRS for almost 20 years and have had the pleasure of working with them throughout that period.

In fact they are working for LAWA and me now. I can count on them to provide excellent and reliable consultant services.

They have never failed to answer my call for professional engineering, project controls and even executive advisory services. Their staff is always professional; their deliverables are always accurate and on time; and

they always stay on or under their budget. I would enthusiastically agree to be contacted should you

have any specoific questions.



To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
<u>See signature above</u>	<u>6/2020</u>
Past Experience/Performance Team Member	Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE MTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

MARRS Services, Inc., 340 E. Commonwealth Avenue, Fullerton, CA 92832
P: 714.213.8650 / F: 714.213.8657

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Timothy Lindholm, Executive Officer, Director of Capital Projects
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. One Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles, CA Los Angeles 90012
City State Country Zip Code
4. (213) 922-7297 LindholmT@Metro.net
Primary / Main Telephone No. Primary / Main Fax No.
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
2016-2020 (Ongoing): Metro Contract #PS26331 - CMSS for Metro Bus Projects
2011-2016: Metro Contract #PS1008002641 - Metro Bus Facilities Projects CMC
As-Needed Contracts - MARRS provided Resident Engineering, Office Engineering, Inspection, Estimating and Scheduling for the \$100 Million Division 13 Parking Garage and Bus Maintenance and Operation Facility. Provided QA/QC and inspection for 13 other projects involving new construction and retrofit.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U - UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S - SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G - GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E - EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Marrs Inc. is an excellent PM/CM firm, and I would
not hesitate to work with them again. They are
highly recommended.

Thank,
Tim Lindholm
ATL

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

(Note: The Technical Evaluation Team may determine any unsatisfactory identified as critical to the procurement)

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
See above	<u>March 5, 2021</u>
Past Experience/Performance Team Member	Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Subconsultant: **NSI Engineering**

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. **Michael Thomas, Principal**

Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative

2. **Biggs Cardosa Associates, Inc.**

Exact Name of Responding Firm

3. **500 S. Main Street, Ste. 1200**

Physical / Mailing Address

Orange

CA

USA

92868

City

State

Country

Zip Code

4. **(714) 714-4665**

Primary / Main Telephone No.

(949) 287-8787

Alt. Telephone No.

mthomas@biggscardosa.com

Email

5. **Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**

Quality Management



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

NSI Engineering provides best-in-class services in their speciality (Quality Management).

We have used them on many projects over the past 10+ years, and consider them one of

our preferred subconsultants on all our current and future projects.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16



Past Experience/Performance Team Member

March 10, 2021

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

NSI Engineering, Inc.
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Erin A. Hoy, President
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- PQM, Inc.
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- 7711 Center Avenue, Suite 670
Physical / Mailing Address
Huntington Beach CA 92647
City State Country Zip Code
- 818-397-2554 erin.hoy@pqminc.com
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Quality Management consulting services, including internal audits, ISO 9001:2015 subject matter experts



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

NSI's team is very reliable and our team will work with them on every opportunity
we can. They excel in organization and problem solving on behalf of their teaming
partners and clients.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
<u>Erin A. Hoy</u> Past Experience/Performance Team Member	<u>02/22/2021</u> Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

NSI Engineering, for work related to the Sound Transit Puyallup Station Access and Improvements Project

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. **Jeff Lehman / Associate**

Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative

2. **KPFF Consulting Engineers**

Exact Name of Responding Firm

3. **1601 Fifth Ave, Suite 1600**

Physical / Mailing Address

Seattle

City

WA

State

United States

Country

98101

Zip Code

4. **206-622-5822**

Primary / Main Telephone No.

206-622-5822

Alt. Telephone No.

jeff.lehman@kpff.com

Email

5. **Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**

NSI's core role has been to provide Design Quality Management for the overall project. More specifically, NSI has or is providing the following: Preparation of the project's Design Quality Management Plan; Preparation of formal Design Quality Procedures, forms and checklists; Preparation of formal training modules and quick tips sheets for core design quality procedures; Conducting audits and surveillance and preparing summary audit reports for Owner review; Responding to design team questions on quality procedures; Preparing continuous improvement requests, as needed in response to audit findings; and Preparing for and facilitating bi-weekly meetings with the Owner.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3


Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below)

Carrie Cabak, as Design Quality Manager, and Eric Satrum as Deputy Design Quality Manager have been great to work with throughout the current project. They have been very thorough in all of their efforts to date, including from procurement to this 3/4 point in the design schedule. They have made themselves available to the Team for questions and provided a very supportive environment for what can be a rather daunting aspect of everyday design. Both Carrie and Eric have been very collaborative and creative in solutions to any issues that may arise on the project, including how to identify root cause of issues they see come up in audits and then implement effective improvement requests to improve help improve the Team's performance on future quality audits. The Owner has been very happy with their collaborative approach as well. We would definitely consider contracting with NSI again to provide Design Quality Management for our next project.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
Jeff Lehman/Associate - KPFF Consulting Engineers	<u>3/16/2021</u>
Past Experience/Performance Team Member	Date
 - ASSOCIATE	<u>3/16/2021</u>



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Diaz Yourman & Associates (Subconsultant)

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Mr. Rudy Emami, Public Works Director
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- City of Anaheim
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- 200 South Anaheim Boulevard, Suite 275
Physical / Mailing Address

Anaheim	CA	USA	92803
City	State	Country	Zip Code
- 714-765-5065
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email remami@anaheim.net
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm

Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC), Phase I - Diaz Yourman & Associates (DYA) provided geotechnical investigations and reports for the Main Building, concourse Bridge, Service Yard Building, Douglass Road Bridge, tunnels, retaining walls, station platform, and parking lots. In addition to conventional recommendations, DYA performed site-specific seismic designs based on Caltrans, AREMO, and AASHTO guidelines. DYA's innovative approach to foundation solutions contributed to the City's saving nearly one million dollars in construction costs. This approach included performing deep dynamic compaction with a mat foundation system, rather than the costly pile foundation system. DYA's effective communication with Caltrans staff ensured timely approvals of the geotechnical submittals. Project Completion Date: 12/2014



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail				Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3


Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

DYA DID AN AMAZING JOB FOR US. I
LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THEM
AGAIN IN THE FUTURE.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
 _____ Past Experience/Performance Team Member	<u>3/3/21</u> Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Diaz Yourman & Associates (Subconsultant)

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Mr. William Farthing, Program Manager

Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative

2. Mott MacDonald / Program Manager for OCTA

Exact Name of Responding Firm

3. 550 Main Street / P.. Box 14184

Physical / Mailing Address

Orange

CA

USA

92863-1584

City

State

Country

Zip Code

4. 714-560-5813

Primary / Main Telephone No.

714-204-8683 (mobile)

Alt. Telephone No.

bfarthing@octa.net

Email

5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm

OC Streetcar -- Project is a two-track streetcar system from the Santa Ana Regional Transportation Center (SARTC) in Santa Ana to the proposed Regional Transit Connection and station in Garden Grove, approximately 4 miles. The project also included design of a maintenance and storage facility and two new bridge structures. Diaz Yourman & Associates (DYA) provided a Phase I Hazardous Waste Environmental Site Assessment for the portion of the project within OCTA's Pacific Electric Railway right-of-way from Harbor Blvd. to North Raitt Street and a geotechnical investigation for the entire alignment, including soil borings, laboratory analysis, engineering analyses, and geotechnical reports. Design was completed June 2018; construction began November 2018, and DYA has been providing construction support/observation services on an as-needed basis.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

14

3/5/21

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Diaz Yourman & Associates (Subconsultant)
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Mr. Scott McKenzie, PE, CEO
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- AZTEC Engineering Group, Inc.
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- 2151 Michelson Drive, Suite 100
Physical / Mailing Address
Irvine CA USA 92621
City State Country Zip Code
- 714-656-2805 602-509-8895 (mobile) smckenzie@aztec.us
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm

This project was a design/build project to improve traffic flow and reduce congestions on I-15 between Cajalco Road Interchange and SR-60 by constructing tolled express lanes in each direction. Improvements were mostly within Right-of-Way (ROW), with a majority of improvements occurring within existing I-15 median. DYA's scope of work included geotechnical investigations for all roadway sections and prepared Materials Reports, Geotechnical Design Reports for roadway sections and soundwalls, and Foundation Reports for retaining walls (standard and non-standard). DYA also performed geotechnical investigations and reports for sign structure foundations and the preliminary investigation and recommendations for the Express Lanes Connector foundation.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

We would (and have) contract with DYA on future projects. The DYA team is focused on client satisfaction and in addition to their technical expertise and commitment to delivery they are a pleasure to work with. We consider them one of our preferred partners.


To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16



3/15/21

Pass Experience/Performance Team Member

Date



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
RFP PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

GPA Consulting
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Carlos Montez, Senior Director-Highway Program
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- 1 Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address

<u>Los Angeles</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>USA</u>	<u>90012</u>
City	State	Country	Zip Code
- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>(213) 418-3241</u> | <u>montezc@metro.net</u> |
| Primary / Main Telephone No. | Alt. Telephone No. Email |
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
NEPA revalidation and updated technical studies, Environmental Commitments Record, jurisdictional delineation, and regulatory permitting applications for the I-5 North HOV/Truck Lanes project in Santa Clarita.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0

RFP PS70129

Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

RFP PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

No additional comments.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

14

3/11/20

Date



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
RFP PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

GPA Consulting
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Ernesto Chaves, Deputy Executive Officer, Program Management/Highway Program
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 1 Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address
Los Angeles CA USA 90012
City State Country Zip Code
4. (213) 418-3142 chavese@metro.net
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Section 4(f) and cultural studies and SR-710 South project.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0

RFP PS70129

Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U - UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S - SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G - GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E - EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

RFP PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

I would contract with this consultant again.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16


Past Experience/Performance Team Member

3.11.20
Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
RFP PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

GPA Consulting
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Isidro Panuco, Senior Manager-Transportation Planning
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 1 Gateway Plaza
Physical / Mailing Address

<u>Los Angeles</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>USA</u>	<u>90012</u>
City	State	Country	Zip Code
4. (213) 418-3208 panucoi@metro.net
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Environmental scoping, EIR/EIS, CIA, DRIS, Energy Study, and NES for the I-605 Corridor project.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0

RFP PS70129

Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: **OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE**

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

RFP PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

The contractor performed good work on the project
and id recommend him for future metro opportunities.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

3/11/20
Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

CAPO Projects Group
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

30200 Rancho Viejo Road Suite I

San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Curt Waggoner - Alternative Delivery Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Sully-Miller Contracting Company
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 135 S State College Blvd
Physical / Mailing Address
Brea, CA USA 92821
City State Country Zip Code
4. (714) 578-9600 (714) 319-6309
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Scheduling - Baseline, Updates, TIAs, What if scenarios



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

I have been working with CAPO for the past (4) years. The majority of my

of my direct experience was with my previous employer, Griffith Company, on

the LAWA Utilities and LAMP Enabling Projects which was a progressive design-

build project supporting LAWA's ConRAC, APM and ITF West Projects. CAPO

demonstrated the ability to manage multiple individual schedules that were


incorporated into an enterprise schedule that allowed for the holistic evaluation of

the program in a real time basis. My experience was very positive and I continue to

work with CAPO at my current employer Sully-Miller.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
	<u>2/23/21</u>
<u>Past Experience/Performance Team Member</u>	<u>Date</u>



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Capo Projects Group [CPG]

Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Travis Sprague, Principal Engineer
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 6075 Kimball Ave
Physical / Mailing Address
Chino CA USA 91708
City State Country Zip Code
4. (909) 993 - 1600 (909) 635 - 5297 tsprague@ieua.org
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm

Capo Projects Group [CPG] provides project scheduling services for the IEUA Engineering department from planning through construction phases. They also provide project specific support such as review of the contractor baseline schedule, monthly contractor schedule update, time impact analysis, change order and estimating.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

I am look forward to the Agency's continued working relationship with CPG. We are confident CPG's professional ability to technically evaluate projects schedules for the Agency and critically review the schedules provided by Contractors. Tom Huntington and Autumn Childers have been great representatives of the company, and they have the ability to work easily within our group and as a representative of the Agency with their scheduling and estimating expertise.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
<u>Travis Sprague</u>	<u>3/3/2021</u>
Past Experience/Performance Team Member	Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

CAPO Group
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Scott Lopian, Sr. Construction Administrator
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Eastern Municipal Water District
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 2270 Trumble Road
Physical / Mailing Address
 Perris CA USA 92572
City State Country Zip Code
4. 951-928-3777 x-4833 951-300-3096 lopians@emwd.org
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. **Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm**
 CAPO Group has been providing as-needed scheduling services of our CIP projects during the construction phase of our Capital Program for a number of years.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

District has found the CAPO Group to bring value to the management of our Capital Program. Their staff come from different industry sectors and can provide lessons learned with real experience markers for all tasks and/or issues presented. The District likes CAPOs ability to have a diverse workforce which provides us lots of opportunity for success due in part to their level of experience throughout the industry. CAPOs ability to understand scheduling, estimating and claims support has been instrumental in keeping the District out of court and out of claims. CAPO has been recommended by the District to many of our neighboring Agencies.

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

Score

16

02/24/2021

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Date



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Proposer and Key Participants shall each submit a total of three (3) completed forms (demonstrating satisfactory or above ratings) from current or past clients. At least 2 of 3 questionnaires must be from past projects completed within the last 5 years. If Proposer is a Joint Venture or partnership, each Joint Venture member or partner must provide a total of three (3) completed forms. Metro will validate the information.

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A CONTRACTOR, SUBCONTRACTOR, OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. CONTRACTOR (IDENTIFIED CONTRACTOR IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Name of Contractor/Subcontractor/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. Physical / Mailing Address

City	State	Country	Zip Code
------	-------	---------	----------
4. Primary / Main Telephone No. Fax No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONTRACTOR IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONTRACTOR IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONTRACTOR ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONTRACTOR IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONTRACTOR IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Contractor accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Contractor provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Contractor demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Contractor provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Contractor exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Contractor provided timely resolution of design/construction defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Contractor developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Contractor paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Contractor provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Contractor provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Contractor provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Contractor effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Contractor obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Contractor effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Contractor mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Contractor? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

This Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
	
_____ Past Experience/Performance Team Member	_____ Date



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Proposer and Key Participants shall each submit a total of three (3) completed forms (demonstrating satisfactory or above ratings) from current or past clients. At least 2 of 3 questionnaires must be from past projects completed within the last 5 years. If Proposer is a Joint Venture or partnership, each Joint Venture member or partner must provide a total of three (3) completed forms. Metro will validate the information.

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A CONTRACTOR, SUBCONTRACTOR, OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. CONTRACTOR (IDENTIFIED CONTRACTOR IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

SECTION 1: CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Guida Survenying, Inc.

Name of Contractor/Subcontractor/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Joe El Harake, Parsons Corporation - Vice President
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Parsons Corporation
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 2201 Dupont Drive, Ste 200
Physical / Mailing Address
Irvine CA U.S. 92612
City State Country Zip Code
4. 949.333.4500 joe.harake@parsons.comn
Primary / Main Telephone No. Fax No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Professional Land Surveying



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONTRACTOR IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONTRACTOR IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONTRACTOR ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONTRACTOR IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONTRACTOR IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass		N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Contractor accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Contractor provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Contractor demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Contractor provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Contractor exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Contractor provided timely resolution of design/construction defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Contractor developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Contractor paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Contractor provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Contractor provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Contractor provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Contractor effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Contractor obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Contractor effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. Contractor mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Contractor? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

This Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Joe E. Naraiki, VP
Proposer's status after review
PARSONS

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

16

2-25-2019

Date



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Proposer and Key Participants shall each submit a total of three (3) completed forms (demonstrating satisfactory or above ratings) from current or past clients. At least 2 of 3 questionnaires must be from past projects completed within the last 5 years. If Proposer is a Joint Venture or partnership, each Joint Venture member or partner must provide a total of three (3) completed forms. Metro will validate the information.

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A CONTRACTOR, SUBCONTRACTOR, OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. CONTRACTOR (IDENTIFIED CONTRACTOR IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

SECTION 1: CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Guida Survenying, Inc.

Name of Contractor/Subcontractor/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Thomas Ionta, PE Vice President
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. TransSystems
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 6 Hutton Center Drive, STE 1250
Physical / Mailing Address
Santa Ana CA U.S. 92707
City State Country Zip Code
4. 714.708.6891 tmionta@transystems.com
Primary / Main Telephone No. Fax No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Professional Land Surveying



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONTRACTOR IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONTRACTOR IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONTRACTOR ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONTRACTOR IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONTRACTOR IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO BE TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail		Pass			N/A
	U	S	G	E		
1. Contractor accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Contractor provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Contractor demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4. Contractor provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
5. Contractor exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Contractor provided timely resolution of design/construction defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7. Contractor developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Contractor paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
10. Contractor provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. Contractor provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
12. Contractor provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
13. Contractor effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
14. Contractor obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
15. Contractor effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
16. Contractor mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Contractor? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Guida does excellent work and they will be on my team for future Proposals, such as the Metro SR-91 WB PS&E

This Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Proposer's status after review

[Handwritten signature]

Past Experience/Performance Team Member

Score

16

2/22/19

Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Casamar Group, LLC
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Jaime Borrás / Technical Project Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- GeoToll, Inc.
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- 8963 Stirling Road, Suite 8
Physical / Mailing Address
Cooper City FL U.S.A. 33328
City State Country Zip Code
- 305-970-3596 jaime@geotoll.com
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Mobile Tolling Express Lanes Road Verification



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/ A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

GeoToll appreciates, very much, Casamar's positive attitude and quick resolution of the changes

in the scope of work, and other issues encountered during the Mobile Tolling Proof of Concept.

And, yes, GeoToll would contract again with Casamar.

Thank you!

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

Score

Proposer's status after review

16


Past Experience/Performance Team Member
Jaime Borrás

2-9-2021
Date



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Casamar Group, LLC
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

- Chris Mockus / Project Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
- AECOM
Exact Name of Responding Firm
- 999 W. Town & Country Road
Physical / Mailing Address
Orange CA U.S.A. 92686
City State Country Zip Code
- 714-567-2740 chris.mockus@aecom.com
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
- Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm

Caltrans Division 54 - Task Order #10 - Assessed the Asphalt Smoothness Technical & Procedures Manual, which included an entire training package with PowerPoint or training all of Caltrans' project / construction managers in each district throughout California.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129

Page 3 of 3


Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

No additional comments

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
	<u>2/16/2021</u>
Past Experience/Performance Team Member	Date
Chris Mockus	



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 1 of 3

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Questionnaire Purpose / Introduction

THIS PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO ASSIST THE LACMTA IN ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE GENERAL PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE OF A PROPOSER, SUBCONSULTANT OR OTHER ENTITY THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING WORK. PROPOSER (IDENTIFIED CONSULTANT IN SECTION 1 BELOW) HAS IDENTIFIED YOUR ORGANIZATION AS A REFERENCE FOR PAST EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE.

SECTION 1: PROPOSER/CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

Casamar Group, LLC
Name of Proposer/Subconsultant/Other Entity

SECTION 2: IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDING FIRM (COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR)

1. Mark Claussen, P.E. / Program Manager
Name & Title of Responding Firm(s) Representative
2. Southwestern Community College District
Exact Name of Responding Firm
3. 900 Otay Lakes Road
Physical / Mailing Address
Chula Vista CA U.S.A. 91910
City State Country Zip Code
4. 619-482-6597 mclaussen@swccd.edu
Primary / Main Telephone No. Alt. Telephone No. Email
5. Brief Description of Work Performed for Responding firm
Project Labor Agreement Administrator and Labor Compliance Program Manager for over \$200 million in construction contracts on a Bond Program valued at \$798 million.



EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM V1.0

PS70129

Page 2 of

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

SECTION 3: OVERALL PROJECT EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE

IN THIS SECTION, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S SATISFACTION WITH THE PAST OR CURRENT OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE CONSULTANT IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 1 ABOVE. THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION IS TO BE ASSESSED ON THE BASIS OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FIRST-HAND/DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH THE CONSULTANT ONLY.

PLEASE PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX, INDICATING YOUR ORGANIZATION'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CONSULTANT IN QUESTION. THE SCALE IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- **U – UNSATISFACTORY:** CONSULTANT IS OR WAS IN DANGER OF NOT BEING ABLE TO SATISFY CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOVERY WAS OR IS NOT LIKELY IN A TIMELY MANNER. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR WHICH THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR INEFFECTIVE.
- **S – SATISFACTORY:** PERFORMANCE MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HAVE YET TO TAKEN, OR HAS NOT BEEN FULLY IMPLEMENTED, BUT APPEAR ONLY SATISFACTORY.
- **G – GOOD:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY MEETS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS SOME MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS APPEAR EFFECTIVE.
- **E – EXCEPTIONAL:** PERFORMANCE CLEARLY EXCEEDS CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS. AREA OF EVALUATION CONTAINS FEW MINOR PROBLEMS FOR WHICH CORRECTIVE ACTION APPEAR HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.

	Fail Pass				N/A
	U	S	G	E	
1. Consultant accomplished/performed work being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Consultant provided experienced design and/or project managers with abilities needed to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Consultant demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace (if necessary) qualified personnel during the contract period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Consultant provided a timely response to nonconformance issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Consultant exercised initiative to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Consultant provided timely resolution of design defects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Consultant developed and met established project schedules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Contractor provided timely cost proposals for changed work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Consultant paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Consultant provided effective Occupational Safety & Health Policies, Procedures & Programs to meet contract requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Consultant provided and effectively implemented Project Quality Program Manual requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Consultant provided Quality Control Inspection Instructions and effectively conducted inspections.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. Consultant effectively implemented requirements for Engineering Design Procedures(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Consultant obtained permits, inspections and necessary approvals from third-party's in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Consultant effectively coordinated with the Buyer/Owner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Consultant mitigated claims and changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**EXPERIENCE/PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

FORM V1.0
PS70129
Page 3 of 3


Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Any other comments you would like to make such as would you contract again with this Consultant? (Note: if no additional comments so indicate below.)

Manage the Project Labor Agreement between the college and the San Diego Building and
Construction Trades Council. Past 5 years over 78 individual trade contracts. Seamless and
constructive relationship established early with local union business managers. Also performs
labor compliance duties on all construction contracts noting deficiencies and is proactive in
gaining (encouraging) compliance by all construction contractors. Will contract again absolutely!

To Pass Consultant/Subconsultant/Other Entity must receive passing marks or a N/A in twelve (12) out of the sixteen (16) questions, at a minimum, for this reference only.

The Experience/Performance Questionnaire shall be considered in the evaluation of the skill and experience of the Proposer and its Key Participants.

	Score
Proposer's status after review	<u>16</u>
 Past Experience/Performance Team Member	<u>2/15/2021</u> Date
Mark Claussen	



Metro Orange Line Balboa Blvd Station



Metro Orange Line Van Nuys Station



Metro Orange Line NoHo Station

BIGGS CARDOSA ASSOCIATES, INC.

500 South Main Street, Suite 1200

Orange, CA 92868

714.550.4665

www.BiggsCardosa.com

