

Introduction

This document provides guidelines for Proposal for review, evaluation and scoring of the proposals for the New Fare Technology System (NFTS).

The technical specifications in the RFP focus on functional and performance requirements, not technical details for the NFTS. Proposals are expected to present information demonstrating how the proposed system and equipment will meet or exceed these requirements and provide CTDOT with a system that fully meets their expectations.

A proposal that simply mirrors the requirements or indicates compliance without explanation and details will be at a distinct disadvantage and may be excluded from review if in the estimation of the Technical Evaluation Committee the proposal does not clearly demonstrate understanding of the overall needs for system operation. Proposals should describe how the requirements will be met and support those assertions with convincing empirical evidence from in-service operation and proven designs. The technical evaluation will result in a comparative evaluation on how well the system offered and described meets these needs.

Evaluation Approach

A competitive process will be used to select a Contractor. The Evaluation Committee will verify proposal compliance then review, evaluate, and score each technical submittal deemed qualified. The submitted price will then be scored and added by pre-determined formula to the technical score to determine the overall score and ranking of each proposal.

Interviews of all proposers within the competitive range could then follow at the discretion of the Technical Evaluation Committee, providing an opportunity for clarification and to demonstrate the proposed equipment.

Following the interviews and if necessary, CTDOT may then issue a Request for Best and Final Offer (BAFO), giving advancing proposers the opportunity to revise their proposals. Following a second round of compliance verification, evaluation and scoring, the Evaluation Committee will identify the preferred proposal and forward its recommendation to the CTDOT Board.

Evaluation Committee Members

The following are the members of the Evaluation Committee (from CTDOT) and will be involved throughout the process, including providing scoring and assessment of compliance:

- Phil Scarrozzo (CTDOT)
- Carrie Rocha (Baker)
- Lisa Rivers (CTDOT)
- Alicia Leite (CTDOT)
- Jennifer Kritzler (CTTransit)
- Phil Fry (CTTransit)
- Ed LaGuardia (Baker)

Phil Scarrozzo will serve as the DOT advisor for the evaluation.

The Evaluation Committee members will be responsible for the review and evaluation of the Contractor Proposals as well as reaching consensus on the scores for each proposal item. The following Committee Advisors (other CTDOT, Michael Baker, and LTK staff) will assist and support

the Evaluation Committee members, as requested in the evaluation and review process, but will not be involved in any scoring: *(Identify additional resources below)*

- Pat Marron, and Bill Anderson (LTK)
- Graham Carey (careyBRT)

Confidentiality

Members of the Evaluation Committee, Committee Advisors and all others either privy to the submitted proposals or receiving briefings on the proposals or evaluation progress will be required to keep the evaluation process confidential. This will preserve the process' integrity and to protect both technical and financial information provided in the proposals.

General Evaluation Process

The evaluation of the proposals will not be a comparative evaluation, but each shall be reviewed as a standalone system. Each proposal will be reviewed in its entirety before proceeding to the next proposal. First a compliance review will be performed, then a technical review, then finally a cost assessment.

Technical Support

The Committee Advisors will be available to provide technical clarification and advice as needed by the Evaluation Committee members.

Proposal Receipt

Proposers are required to submit their hard copies and electronic copies of all proposal documentation except the price proposal, which will be in a separately sealed envelope (one electronic copy and one hard copy). The price proposal will be entrusted to CTDOT's contract administrator for safekeeping and will be opened and reviewed by him / her.

Compliance Review

A compliance review will be performed first and will assure that the proposal includes all of the requisite elements as identified in the Instructions to Proposers.

Missing, unsigned or altered certification forms or missing proposal sections may be cause for proposal rejection per the RFP and instructions. If a proposal is rejected during an initial screening, the Evaluation Committee may be instructed not to review that proposal.

Technical Review

A copy of each proposal (excluding price documentation) will be issued for review to each committee member and advisor. Reviewers are free to read and evaluate the documents at their offices, provided the material is kept secure and confidential. Members and Advisors are expected to complete their individual review of the proposals prior to a meeting of the Evaluation Committee as a whole.

The following are the criteria, specified in the RFP, by which the proposals for the NFTS will be evaluated:

SELECTION CRITERIA:

The evaluation of NFTS Proposals received will use the following general criteria and relative weights:

- Technical Proposal 70%
- Price Proposal 30%

Technical Evaluation

The main criteria for evaluation of the Technical Proposals are identified below. The maximum number of points that will be awarded for each criterion is shown. These are based on verification of experience and the requirements as stated in the RFP for each criterion below:

	<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Maximum Points per Criterion (“Technical Score”)</i>
A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Response: Proposed System - Extent of Compliance with Technical Specification Requirements, Approach to the work, Understanding of the NFTS Needs, Compatibility with Other CTDOT/CTTransit Systems and Ability to Meet Project Milestones: <p>Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDS Hardware and Software; • Interfaces With Existing Systems; • Understanding of CTDOT Needs; • Implementation on a Phased Schedule; • GCS Networking, Hardware and Software; • Validating Fare boxes; • Non-validating Fare boxes; • Revenue Collection Process; • SAP’s; • PV’s; • Administrative POS; • HFIT’s; • MVM Equipment, Hardware and Software; • Mobile Ticketing Process; and; • Support Services. 	40

	<p>Scoring: Compliance with the Scope of Work = 20 (twenty) points. Less than full compliance with Scope of Work will cause a reduction in points that are awarded by the State’s evaluators. Up to 20 (twenty) additional points may be awarded by the State’s evaluators for additional value elements offered to the State in the Proposer’s Technical Proposal.</p>	
<p>B.</p>	<p>Proposer Experience: Proposer qualifications, experience and references in providing and implementing similar systems. Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer shall have at least 10 years of experience in providing similar systems (components, size and nature). • Provide examples of at least 3 and up to 5 previous projects similar to this project that was procured in the last 3-5 years. • Demonstrate experience with public sector transit systems. • Demonstrate experience in Central Management System hosting. • Demonstrate experience performing on-site training programs. • Demonstrate experience with hardware and software support. • Owner/client references will be a critical element of this evaluation. Up to three owner / client references are expected, although the State considers more, well documented references to be preferable. <p>*Bidder must provide contact information for owner/ client follow-up telephone interviews with State evaluators.</p> <p>Scoring: Compliance with experience criteria, as documented by references = 10 (ten) points. Less than full compliance with Experience criteria will cause a reduction in points that are awarded by the State’s evaluators. Up to 10 (ten) additional points may be awarded by the State’s evaluators for additional experience / qualifications offered to the State in the Proposer’s Technical Proposal.</p>	<p>20</p>
<p>C.</p>	<p>Project Management: Proposed project team qualifications, experience, and certifications for personnel and organization, based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated competence of each key team member, documented by client / owner references in the function assigned in the organizational chart. • Cross-reference each key team member with their involvement on the example projects presented under firm’s experience in Section B. • Provide evidence of qualifications, as applicable, for each key team member. This may include degrees, certifications, licenses, or other documents to support an individual’s abilities for the role proposed. • Approach to project management and scheduling • Approach to quality assurance, including the related qualifications and experience of the individual(s) proposed for this specific role. <p>*Bidder must provide contact information for this information to allow CTDOT to perform follow-up telephone interviews with State evaluators.</p> <p>Possible Scoring: 0 – 2 points for each of the five considerations listed above, however, the State’s evaluators may apply different weights for any of the above factors.</p>	<p>10</p>

--	--	--

The State may identify and use more detailed evaluation criteria, which will be based on the main criteria identified above.

Price Evaluation

The Proposal with the lowest proposed price for the Base System (excluding Options) will receive the maximum of twenty-five (25) points for the price. Other higher priced Proposals will receive fewer points based on the following formula.

$$\text{Price Score} = (\text{Lowest proposed price for total cost (Base System)} / \text{proposed price for total cost (Base System)}) \times 25$$

The CTDOT selection committee can award up to five (5) additional points to the Price Score for the Base System for Option pricing for any or all options that the selection committee deems advantageous to the State.

Total Score

$$\text{Total Score} = \text{Price Score} + \text{Technical Score}$$

Award may be made to the Proposer with the highest Total Score on the basis of the above criteria and calculations and on the rights reserved to the State in the Conditions of Proposal section of this RFP.

Options will be considered for inclusion in the Agreement at the State's sole discretion.

Discussions for Clarification

As part of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Committee reserves the right to request additional information from any or all Proposers for clarification of their Proposals at any point during this process, even to request additional information as a part of the Compliance Verification.

If required, a request for Best and Final Offers (BAFO) may also be initiated by CTDOT after review of any clarifications and appropriate modifications of the Technical and/or Contractual requirements.

Discussions may be conducted individually with each Proposer within the competitive range. These may include meetings or telephone conversations between individual Proposers and all or part of the Evaluation Committee, or written correspondence between CTDOT and the Proposer. However, oral representations by either CTDOT, the Evaluation Committee, or a Proposer, while potentially useful and necessary to progress the course of the negotiations, will not be considered binding.

CTDOT reserves the right to investigate the qualifications of all Proposers under consideration and to confirm any part of the information furnished by a Proposer, or to require other evidence of managerial, financial or technical capabilities which are considered necessary for the successful performance of the work.

Pre-Award Review of Proposer Facilities

After the Proposals have been received and prior to the award of the Contract, CTDOT reserves the right to perform an on-site review of the Proposer's facilities. This review will serve to verify data and representations submitted by the Proposer and may be used to determine whether the Proposer has an adequate, qualified, and experienced staff, and could fulfill the requirements of the Contract.

During this review, CTDOT may also verify whether the Proposer has adequate financial capability to fulfill the Contract requirements. Should CTDOT determine that the Proposal or subsequently submitted documentation has material misrepresentations or that the size or nature of the Proposer's facilities or the number of experienced personnel (including technical staff) is not adequate to ensure satisfactory Contract performance, or ascertains other basis for concern as to successful Proposer's ability to fulfill the Contract, CTDOT has the right to reject the Proposal.

Scoring and Ranking

After the technical evaluation has been completed, the technical score established for each proposal will be documented in a memorandum to the contract file. A final score for each proposal will then be calculated that incorporates the technical and price scores, and will rank proposals by the total score. The Evaluation Committee will then recommend whether to award the Contract, establish a competitive range, or reject all proposals.

Negotiations and Request for Best and Final Offer

If a competitive range is established, the Evaluation Committee will hold separate interviews with each proposer within the competitive range. During these interviews, the committee may seek clarification of specific elements of the proposal, clarify the requirements in the specification, and discuss shortcomings of the proposal. The committee will not disclose to a proposer the number or identity of other proposers, any scores or rankings, prices, or any information from proposals other than their own.

Best and Final Offer

Following the first round of evaluation and subsequent discussions, CTDOT may issue clarifications or modifications to the RFP documents and Technical Specifications and request a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) from Proposers in the competitive range. BAFOs will be reviewed, evaluated and scored according to the same procedures and criteria followed during the initial round of evaluations.

Evaluation Report

After the evaluation has been completed, the Evaluation Committee will prepare a summary written evaluation report for review by CTDOT. The evaluation report will contain the following for the initial review as well as for the BAFO (if a BAFO is requested):

- List of all Proposers
- Technical Evaluation
- Technical Score for each proposal
- Price and Price Score for each proposal
- Final score for each proposal
- List of Proposers included in the competitive range, and rationale for their selection
- Recommendation
- Rationale for recommendation

Contract Award

After final Proposal evaluation and scoring is completed, the Evaluation Committee may recommend that the Contract be awarded to the highest ranked Proposer. The Evaluation Committee also

reserves the right to refrain from making a recommendation in the event that no Proposal is deemed advantageous to CTDOT.

No proposal will be returned to the proposer after the final date and time set for proposal opening. All proposals will become the property of CTDOT, pursuant to the Public Records Act. If the proposer wishes to maintain the confidential nature of any confidential financial information provided to CTDOT, such information will be designated as such in the manner required by law to preserve its confidentiality. Notwithstanding the foregoing, CTDOT will disclose documents as required by a Public Records Act request.

Taking the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee under advisement, the CTDOT Board will either award a contract or reject the recommendation.

Anyone with questions is encouraged to contact CTDOT Project Manager, Phil Scarrozzo.