

## **TECHNICAL REVIEW ELEMENTS**

### **Introduction**

The Selection Committee for CT **fastrak** met on February 7, 2014 to review, evaluate, and scoring the proposals received for the Ticket Vending Machine System (TVMS).

Four proposals were received, as follows:

1. Scheidt & Bachmann USA, Inc., 31 North Avenue, Burlington, MA 01803
2. Parkeon, Inc., 40 Twosome Drive, Ste 7, Moorestown, NJ 08057
3. Caracal Enterprises LLC dba VenTek International (VenTek), 1260 Holm Road, Suite A, Petaluma, CA 94954
4. EPCOM World Industries, 9 Fairfield Drive, Pawcatuck, CT 06379

Proposals were required to present 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 Phil Scarrozzo. The selection committee members (Committee) were Lisa Rivers (CTDOT), Jennifer Kritzler (CTTRANSIT), Phil Fry (CTTRANSIT), Carrie Rocha (Baker), and Dwight Schock (Baker). LTK 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 four proposals. Phil Scarrozzo convened a Committee meeting on February 7, 2014 to review and evaluate the Proposals. The Committee, using a spreadsheet that is attached to this recommendation, identified strengths and weaknesses of the four proposals based on the information presented in each of the four proposals. The Committee, then, scored the four proposals, developing one overall initial technical evaluation. None of the four proposals earned the full thirty-three (33) technical points available under the scoring criteria presented in the RFP. Two proposals, Parkeon's and VenTek's, were found eligible for compliance points, but required several clarifications. The other two proposals, Scheidt & Bachman and EPCOM, earned zero points for RFP technical compliance.

After developing that initial technical evaluation, Phil Scarrozzo developed a combined Technical and Price score for the four proposals, using the initial Technical Scores developed above and a scoring based on the Price Proposals that were provided in separate envelopes. Parkeon, based on its low price, received 50 price points. VenTek received 35 price points. Scheidt & Bachman and EPCOM received 16 price points. Thus, even with "compliant" scores on the Technical criteria, neither Scheidt & Bachman nor EPCOM was able to score enough points for selections. Scheidt & Bachman and EPCOM were dropped from further consideration at the February 7, 2014 meeting.

The Committee determined that technical compliance clarifications were required from the remaining two proposers, Parkeon and VenTek. As a result of the meeting, those requests for clarification were transmitted in the form of questions that were drafted and sent to Parkeon and VenTek on February 10, 2014. Both firms provided their responses (attached) on February 12, 2014.

The Committee, under Phil Scarrozzo's direction, met a second time on February 12, 2014. At this meeting, the Committee reviewed Parkeon's and VenTek's clarifications, finalized its Technical Scores, again reviewed the Price Scores, and recommended VenTek for Award.

### **Recommendation and Rationale for Recommendation**

The Committee recommends VenTek for award based on the foregoing discussion and the information contained in the Evaluation Spreadsheet. The spreadsheet reflects the base proposal scoring for all four firms and also reflects the clarifications that VenTek and Parkeon provided via their answers to CTDOT's questions.

VenTek's proposal was deemed superior for:

- Compliance with the Technical requirements
- Compliance with Project Management requirements
- Compliance Proposer Experience requirements
- Second ranked and scored price

Parkeon's proposal was evaluated #2 due to:

- Non-compliance with ADA requirements, lack of bill return for cancelled transactions, capacity for only 500 bills vs. the required 750, and concerns about the TVM's ability to issue the required 10 tickets without jamming.
- Parkeon was determined to be compliant with the Project Management and Proposer Experience requirements
- Ranked #1 for price

The Committee recommends that Phil Scarrozzo check VenTek's references and, if references are satisfactory, proceed with Award.