

INTER OFFICE MEMO

To: O&S Committee Date: April 1, 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 14th 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 31st, 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: Staff recommends the O&S committee forward to the board, a resolution

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: 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 14th 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.

Qualifications of the Firm:
 Experience in performing similar work, company stability, quality of references

Staffing and Project Organization:
 Qualifications of project staff, key personnel, retention of existing employees

3. Work Plan: 20%

Contractors depth of understanding of County Connection requirements, reasonableness of proposed work plan, appropriateness of resource allocation

- Creative Approach/Productivity Improvement Plan: 10%
 Proposed creative approaches to reduce costs and improve system productivity
- 5. Reasonableness of Cost Proposal: 25% Reasonableness of price and competitiveness of price as compared to other proposers

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 Expense	4,830,680.00	4,770,279.00	4,804,885.00	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	
	•				

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	2	4.2	4.8	4	4.2
=	Proposer Management Experience	15	14.4	14.2	13.6	11
≡	Staffing Plan	10	8.8	6	9.9	9.2
<u>≥</u>	. 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	9.2
VI.	. Financial Viability & Stability of Organization	10	10	9.6	8.2	10
 	VII. Reasonableness of Cost Proposal	20	18.3	12.8	13.8	16.8
 	VIII. Cost Reduction/Service Improvement Plan	15	9.4	10.8	11.4	9.8
	Subtotal	100	89.1	83.8	81.4	85.2
5	VII. Employee retention Preference, CA Labor Code § 1071(d) 10% of Subtotal	10	8.9	8.4	8.1	8.5
	Total Proposer Score	110	98.0	92.2	89.5	93.7