

## **INTER OFFICE MEMO**

**To:** Board of Directors **Date:** April 11, 2014

From: William Churchill, Director of Transportation

Subject: Recommendation to
Award Contract for Provision of

Paratransit Operations & Maintenance Services

## Summary:

On December 31, 2013, following board approval, staff released a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the provision of transportation services including LINK and BART ADA Paratransit, Saint Mary's Shuttle, California State University East Bay, Alamo Creek, Concord Police Department and other special transportation services as needed.

Four bids were received by the deadline of March 14<sup>th</sup> 2014, from the following companies; First Transit, Keolis Transit Services, MV Transportation and Veolia Transportation. All four proposals met the minimum standards set forth in the RFP and were subsequently evaluated. A review panel was formed which evaluated each proposal and interviewed the applicants on Monday March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2014.

The review panel reached a consensus on their recommendation to award a contract to First Transit Inc. as the highest scoring bidder for the provision of Transportation & Maintenance Services.

**Recommendation:** The O&S committee recommends the board approve resolution No. 2014-015

authorizing the General Manager to enter into an agreement with First Transit Inc. for three years with two one year options for the provision of Paratransit Operations & Maintenance services. The contract will be developed by Legal Counsel with the appropriate mechanisms to provide contractual protections for

County Connection

**Financial Implications:** The draft FY 2015 budget for purchased transportation is \$5,210,386. The

recommended bidder, First Transit, provided a bid of \$5,241,792 for the

first year which is slightly higher than the current draft budget. It is

important to note the current draft budget for FY 2015 will not be finalized until May 2014. The total cost for the three year contract will be \$16,401,051

**Attachments:** 1) Resolution No. 2014-015

2) Master Evaluation & Scoring Sheet

**Additional Background Information:** 

The O&S Committee work with staff for several months to develop a scope of work for the provision of Paratransit Operations and Maintenance services. From this work a Request for Proposals was developed and released on December 31, 2013.

Four bids were received by the deadline of March 14<sup>th</sup> 2014, from the following companies; First Transit, Keolis Transit Services, MV Transportation and Veolia Transportation. All four proposals met the minimum standards set forth in the RFP and were subsequently evaluated. A review panel consisting of The General Manager, the Director of Transportation, the Senior Manager of Transportation and two General Managers from other Authorities was formed to evaluate the proposals. Proposals were evaluated by each member of the evaluation team across the following parameters and a combined average score was created.

Financial Viability and Stability of Organization10%
Firm Experience, including Technical Competence demonstrated on Past Projects20%
Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel and staffing plan, including training, technical experience and other service quality programs 25%
Creative Approach/Service Improvement Plan15%
Corporate Support, and Implementation Plan 10%
Reasonableness of Cost Proposal20%
Retention of Current Employees – Labor Code 1070 et seq10%
Total

Additionally, each of the four firms was interviewed by the evaluation team providing the opportunity for each firm to earn an additional twenty five points toward their total score. The interview process was designed to gain a better understanding and receive clarification where necessary regarding the submitted proposals.

Following the interview process the evaluation team, upon review of proposal scoring and interview scoring, reached a consensus on their recommendation to award a contract to First Transit as the highest scoring proposer. While the proposals varied in their strengths and weaknesses from staffing levels to technology solutions and financial viability, in the end the evaluation team was unanimous in its recommendation of First Transit. Please refer to attached evaluation & scoring sheet.

## **Financial Implications:**

Although the evaluation team looked at all components of the proposals, there were two primary areas that received additional focus, reasonableness of the cost proposal and the cost reduction/service improvement plan. From a financial perspective the evaluation team was rather surprised at the wide spread of proposed costs. There was a 4.5 million dollar difference between the lowest cost proposal and the most expensive proposal. The following chart provides a table of total bid costs across the various proposals as well as total hourly cost created by adding the hourly expenses and the fixed monthly expenses together and dividing by the total projected hours of service.

# Proposal Cost Comparison Total Contract Costs and Combined Monthly + Hour Cost/ Total Annual Hours

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	3 Year Total
First					
Transit	Total Annual Expense	5,241,792.00	5,462,809.00	5,696,450.00	16,401,051.00
	Combined Hourly Rate	52.27	53.45	54.69	
Keolis	Total Annual Expense	6,114,816.00	6,284,830.00	6,545,860.00	18,945,506.00
	Combined Hourly Rate	60.97	61.49	62.85	
MV	Total Annual Evnance	4 920 690 00	4 770 270 00	4,804,885.00	14 405 944 00
IVIV	Total Annual Expense	4,830,680.00	4,770,279.00	4,604,665.00	14,405,844.00
	Combined Hourly Rate	48.17	46.67	46.13	
Veolia	Total Annual Expense	5,708,295.00	5,983,748.00	6,226,826.00	17,918,869.00
	Combined Hourly Rate	56.92	58.55	59.78	17,313,003.00

Although MV Transportation presented the lowest cost proposal it was not sufficient to overcome the total scores when all aspects of the other proposals were evaluated. When considering the reasonableness of the various cost proposals within the context of the services to be provided the clear winner is First Transit. The proposed first contract year proposal represents a 2.3% increase over the projected current year costs. Veolia Transportation provided the closest more expensive first year contract proposal representing a 10.3% increase over the current year projected expenses. Keolis Transportation provided the highest first year contract cost representing an increase of 16.2% over the projected current year expense.

All firms proposed the development of a relationship with taxi companies as one of the methods for improving productivity and reducing costs. None of the firms built any savings into their proposals but rather stated that as relationships with taxi companies were formed and opportunities to defer rides to taxis the savings would be passed on to County Connection. Through the interview process it became clear the only firm to actually contact and meet with various taxi providers was First Transit. The consensus from the proposers implied that taxi companies in central Contra Costa are not well regulated and need to mature before they can be valuable partners in absorbing some LINK trips. Having said this all proposers expressed a

willingness to actively work with a couple of taxi companies to help the process along in meeting the County connection goals.

In addition to developing relationships with taxi providers all firms proposed different software tools that provide enhanced management of the existing Trapeeze paratransit scheduling software that will result in improved on-time performance and ridership productivity. The evaluation team spent considerable time evaluating these tools and interviewing proposers to gain a stronger knowledge of how they work. Similar to developing a relationship with a taxi provider the potential savings for the use of these technological solutions are not built into the base cost proposals but would rather would be passed on to County Connection as the tools are implemented.

# County Connection Request for Proposal for Paratransit Services **Master Evaluation & Scoring Sheet**

# **Consolidated Score Sheet**

	Criteria	Max Points	First Transit	Keolis	MV	Veolia
<u>-</u>	Overall Quality of the proposal	5	4.2	4.8	7	4.2
≓	Proposer Management Experience	15	14.4	14.2	13.6	11
≡	Staffing Plan	10	8.8	6	9:9	2.6
<u>&gt;</u>	IV. Overall Company Experience in Providing Similar Services	15	15	13	14.8	15
>	Overall Technical Capability to Provide Quality Service	10	6	9.6	6	6.2
<u> </u>	Financial Viability & Stability of Organization	10	10	9.6	8.2	10
VII.	VII. Reasonableness of Cost Proposal	20	18.3	12.8	13.8	16.8
<b> </b>	VIII. Cost Reduction/Service Improvement Plan	15	9.4	10.8	11.4	8.6
*	* Total Proposer Score	100	89.1	83.8	81.4	85.2

this chart did include the score for retention in order to demonstrate the raw score of each proposal. \* Since all proposals received the 10% Employee Retention Preference, CA Labor Code § 1071(d),

### **RESOLUTION NO. 2014-015**

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CENTRAL CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT AUTHORITY STATE OF CALIFORNIA

\* \* \*

## AUTHORIZING AWARD OF A CONTRACT TO FIRST TRANSIT, INC. TO PROVIDE PARATRANSIT AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES

WHEREAS, the County of Contra Costa and the Cities of Clayton, Concord, the Town of Danville, Lafayette, Martinez, the Town of Moraga, Orinda, Pleasant Hill, San Ramon and Walnut Creek (hereinafter "Member Jurisdictions") have formed the Central Contra Costa Transit Authority ("County Connection"), a joint exercise of powers agency created under California Government Code Section 6500 et seq., for the joint exercise of certain powers to provide coordinated and integrated public transportation services within the area of its Member Jurisdictions: and

WHEREAS, on December 31, 2013 County Connection issued a Request for Proposals To Provide Paratransit and Associated Services (RFP 2013-MA-02) for the operation and maintenance of (1) County Connection ADA paratransit services (LINK), (2) BART ADA paratransit services, (3) Route 250, (4) Route 260, (5) the Alamo Creek Demand Responsive Flex Route, (6) Concord Police Department special requests; and (7) other special transportation services as needed; and

WHEREAS, four proposals were received by the March 14, 2014 deadline and were evaluated by a five-member evaluation committee, which also conducted interviews with all of the proposers on March 31, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the evaluation committee unanimously concluded that First Transit, Inc. was the highest ranked proposer based on the evaluation criteria contained within the Request for Proposals; and

WHEREAS, the evaluation committee recommends award of the subject contract to First Transit, Inc. which recommendation was supported by the Operations and Scheduling Committee at its April 11, 2014 meeting.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Central Contra Costa Transit Authority Board of Directors authorizes award of a contract to First Transit, Inc. for paratransit and associated services as described in RFP 2013-MA-02 for a three-year base term commencing July 1, 2014, for a total three-year estimated cost of \$16,401,051, based upon the following:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Fixed Monthly Rate	\$87,813	\$90,829	\$94,293
Service Hour Rate	\$41.75	\$42.79	\$43.83
Estimated Service Hours	100,287	102,203	104,157
Total Annual Cost	\$5,241,792	\$5,462,809	\$5,696,450

; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager is authorized to execute a contract with First Transit, Inc. on behalf of County Connection in full conformity with all of the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents, subject to approval as to form by Legal Counsel.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager is authorized to execute up to two additional one-year option terms to the contract with First Transit, Inc. in accordance with the price proposal submitted by First Transit, Inc. for the option terms, provided that exercise of such options is in the best interest of CCCTA.

R	Regularly passed and adopted this 17th day of A	pril 2014, by the following vote:
A	AYES:	
N	NOES:	
A	ABSTAIN:	
A	ABSENT:	
	Bol	o Simmons, Chair, Board of Directors
ATTEST:	:	
Lathina Hi	Hill, Clerk to the Board	_