

# TECHNICAL REVIEW ELEMENTS

## Introduction

The Selection Committee for CT**fastrak** met on April 8, 2014 to review, evaluate, and score the proposals received for the New Fare Technology System (NFTS).

Three proposals were received, as follows:

1. Scheidt & Bachmann USA, Inc., 31 North Avenue, Burlington, MA 01803
2. SPX Genfare, 751 Pratt Blvd. Elk Grove Village, IL 60007
3. LECIP, 1011 E. Touhy Avenue, Suite 140, Des Plaines, IL 60018, USA

Proposals were required to provide information demonstrating how the proposed system and equipment would meet or exceed the RFP requirements and provide CTDOT with a system that fully meets their expectations.

The proposals were evaluated by a CTDOT appointed committee, chaired by Philip Scarrozzo (CTDOT). The selection committee members (Committee) were Lisa Rivers (CTDOT), Alicia Leite (CTDOT), Jennifer Kritzler (CTTRANSIT), Phil Fry (CTTRANSIT), Carrie Rocha (Baker) and Edward La Guardia (Baker). Pat Marron (LTK), Bill Anderson (LTK), and Graham Carey (careyBRT) provided technical input to the committee, but did not participate in the scoring or evaluation of the proposals.

## Evaluation Process

The Committee members received and reviewed the three proposals. Philip Scarrozzo convened a Committee meeting on April 8, 2014 to review and evaluate the Proposals. The Committee, using a spreadsheet that is attached to this recommendation, identified strengths and weaknesses of the three proposals based on the information presented in each of the three proposals. The Committee, then, scored the three proposals, developing one overall initial technical evaluation

None of the three proposals earned the full thirty-three (33) technical points available under the scoring criteria presented in the RFP. The S&B, Genfare and LECIP proposals were found eligible for compliance points, but required several clarifications. The Committee determined that technical compliance clarifications were required from all three of the proposers, Scheidt & Bachmann, Genfare & LECIP. As a result of the meeting, those requests for clarification were transmitted in the form of questions that were drafted and sent to Scheidt & Bachmann, Genfare, and LECIP on April 11, 2014. All firms provided their responses (attached) on April 22, 2014. The committee evaluated the proposals along with the technical clarifications responses.

The Committee, under Philip Scarrozzo's direction, met a third time on April 29, 2014. At this meeting, the Committee reviewed the proposals, clarifications and price proposals. After developing that initial technical evaluation, Philip Scarrozzo developed a combined Technical and Price score for the three proposals, using the initial Technical Scores developed above and scoring based on the Price Proposals that were provided in separate envelopes.

Based on the scoring, the committee, finalized its Technical Scores, again reviewed the Price Scores, and recommended Scheidt & Bachmann for Award.

## **Recommendation and Rationale for Recommendation**

The Committee recommended Scheidt & Bachman for award based on the foregoing discussion and the information contained in the Evaluation Spreadsheet. The spreadsheet reflects the base proposal scoring for all three firms and also reflects the clarifications that Genfare, Scheidt & Bachmann, and LECIP provided via their answers to CTDOT's questions.

Scheidt & Bachmann's proposal was deemed superior for:

- Compliance with the Technical requirements
- Compliance with Project Management requirements
- Compliance Proposer Experience requirements
- Ranked #2 for price

Genfare proposal was evaluated #2 due to:

- Non-compliance with specific technical requirements,
- Ranked #1 for price

The Committee recommends that Philip Scarrozzo check Scheidt & Bachmann's references and, if references are satisfactory, proceed with award.