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# **SUMMARY**

Request for Proposal (RFP) 5217028 solicited proposals for Payment Acceptance Devices (PAD) and Transit Processor Services Master Agreements (“MSA” or “Agreements”) for use solely by local governmental transit agencies that operate public transportation services. The MSAs resulting from the RFP will be for five (5) years with the option to extend two (2) additional (2) year periods or portion thereof at the same rates, terms, and conditions.

The RFP was a one-step procurement consisting of a Final Proposal submittal. The RFP was conducted using the two-envelope procedure: the first for the administrative and technical response, and the second for cost.

Final selection was based on the highest total scores to the responsive and responsible bidders for the following categories:

* Category A - Payment Acceptance Devices (PAD) – up to seven (7) awarded MSAs.
* Category B - Transit Processor Services – up to four (4) awarded MSAs.

# **BACKGROUND**

The California Integrated Travel Project (Cal-ITP) requested DGS-PD create procurement vehicle(s) for local transit agencies to procure Payment Acceptance Devices, including supporting services, and Transit Processor services, for transitioning to a contactless EMV fare payment system.

# **RELEASE OF RFP**

RFP 5217028 was published on the California State Contracts Register (CSCR) on June 30, 2021.

Six (6) addenda were issued and published on the CSCR as follows:

| Addendum | Addendum Action |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | Attachment 1 – Key Action Dates updated.  |
| 2. | * Language added to RFP Section 1.1
* Language added to RFP Section 3.1.6
* Attachment references corrected in RFP Section 6.3.1
* Reference was corrected in RFP Section 6.3.5.1
* Reference was corrected in RFP Section 6.3.5.2
* Language added to RFP Section 6.3.5.2a
* Proposal Due Date was updated in Attachment 1 – Key Action Date
* Attachment 2A Cost Workbook was updated.
* Attachment 2B Cost Workbook was updated.
* Attachment 4A Category A – Technical Questionnaire was updated.
* Attachment 7 – Exhibit A – Section 6.1.3 language was updated.
* Attachment 7 – Exhibit A – Section 15 language was updated.
* Attachment 7 – Exhibit A.1 – Section 1 symbol } was added.
* Attachment 7 – Exhibit B – Section 1 and Section 6 language was added
* Exhibit A.2 – PAD Specifications – Exhibit was updated.
 |
| 3. | * Non-Cost Score Calculation points have been updated in RFP Section 6.3.1.
* Key Action Dates have been updated in Attachment 1 – Key Action Dates
* Language added to Attachment 7 -Exhibit A – Section 6.2.1a.
* Language has been added to Attachment 7 – Exhibit A – Section 16
* Language has been added to Attachment 7 – Exhibit A – Section 17
* Attachment 3A – Category A – Narrative Response has been updated.
* Attachment 3B – Category B – Narrative Response has been updated.
 |
| 4. | * Attachment 1 – Key Action Dates – last day to protest requirements date has been updated.
* Attachment 4A – Category A – Technical Questionnaire has been updated.
* Exhibit A.2 – PAD Specifications was updated.
 |
| 5. | * Attachment 2B – Category B – Cost Workbook was updated.
 |
| 6. | * Attachment 1 – Key Action Dates proposal submission due date was updated.
* Attachment 2A – Category A – Cost Workbook was updated.
 |

## 3.1 BIDDER’S CONFERENCE

A Bidder’s Conference was held on July 12, 2021, at 10:00am PT.

## 3.2 DRAFT PROPOSALS

The RFP did not include Draft Proposals.

## 3.3 FINAL PROPOSALS

Final Proposals were due on September 13, 2021, by 5:00pm PT.

Category A

Final Proposals for Category A were received by the due date and time from the ten (10)Bidders listed below:

| Bidder |
| --- |
| Access Limited |
| Ask-int Tag, LLC dba Paragon ID |
| Init Innovations in Transportation, Inc. |
| Kuba, Inc. |
| Masabi, LLC |
| Modeshift, Inc. |
| Parkeon, Inc. dba Flowbird |
| SC Soft Americas, LLC |
| Vix Technology (USA), Inc. |
| ZED Digital |

Category B

Final Proposals for Category B were received by the due date and time from the twelve (12)Bidders listed below:

| Bidder |
| --- |
| Ask-int Tag, LLC dba Paragon ID |
| Bytemark, Inc. |
| Enghouse Transportation Public Safety |
| Init Innovations in Transportation, Inc. |
| Little Pay, Inc. |
| Masabi, Inc. |
| Modeshift, LLC. |
| Parkeon, Inc. dba Flowbird |
| SC Soft Americas, LLC |
| Scheidt-Bachmann, Inc. |
| Vix Technology (USA), Inc. |
| ZED Digital |

# **EVALUATION**

## 4.1 EVALUATION TEAM

The Evaluation Team consisted of the following individuals:

Adriana Barajas – DGS-PD Procurement Official

Sarah Samaan – DGS PD Back-Up Procurement Official

Matt Walters – Team Member – Technical Engineer

Julie Matthews – DGS PD Subject Matter Expert

Gillian Gillett – Caltrans Subject Matter Expert

Jochem Baud – Caltrans Subject Matter Expert

Zachary Karson – Caltrans Subject Matter Expert

Nawras Akroush – Caltrans Subject Matter Expert

Regina Liptak – Caltrans Subject Matter Expert

## 4.2 ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE

The Evaluation Team reviewed all submittals for administrative and technical compliance.

Category A:

Seven (7) proposals in Category A were found to be administratively and/or technically non-compliant.

ADMINISTRATIVELY NON-COMPLIANT

|  |
| --- |
| Bidder |
| Access Limited |
| Masabi, Inc. |
| Modeshift, LLC. |
| Parkeon, Inc. dba Flowbird |
| ZED Digital |

TECHNICALLY NON-COMPLIANT

|  |
| --- |
| Bidder |
| Ask-int Tag, LLC dba Paragon ID |
| Masabi, Inc. |
| Vix Technology (USA), Inc. |
| ZED Digital |

Category B:

Eight (8) proposals in Category B were found to be administratively and/or technically non-compliant.

ADMINISTRATIVELY NON-COMPLIANT

| Bidder |
| --- |
| Ask-int Tag, LLC dba Paragon ID |
| Masabi, Inc. |
| Modeshift, LLC. |
| Parkeon, Inc. dba Flowbird |
| SC Soft Americas, LLC. |
| Scheidt-Bachmann USA, Inc. |
| VIX Technology USA, Inc. |
| ZED Digital |

TECHNICALLY NON-COMPLIANT

|  |
| --- |
| Bidder |
| Masabi, Inc. |

In accordance with RFP Section 6.2, Evaluation of Final Proposals, the cost envelopes for proposals that were administratively or technically non-compliant were not opened.

## 4.3 MATERIAL DEVIATIONS

Category A

The following deviations were deemed material, therefore considered non-compliant.

| Bidder  | Category A Requirement | Administrative or Technical Deviation | Bidder Response or Material Deviation |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Access Limited | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative | Two (2) of the three (3) Customer References did not respond within five (5) business days after request by the State. |
| Masabi, Inc. | RFP Section 3.1.15, Federal Transit Administration Requirements (M) | Administrative  | Attachment 6 – Federal Certification Form of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension, (Nonprocurement) was signed by the Subcontractor. |
| Modeshift, LLC. | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative  | One (1) of the three (3) Customer References did not respond within five (5) business days after request by the State. |
| Parkeon, Inc. dba Flowbird | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative | No Customer References received within (5) business days after request by the State. |
| ZED Digital | RFP Section 3.1.1.1,Category A Products and Services (M – Category A only) | Administrative  | Attachment 3A – Category A - Narrative Response was not submitted with Proposal.  |
| ZED Digital | RFP Section 3.1.1.1,Category A Products and Services (M – Category A only) | Administrative  | Attachment 5A – Category A – Integration Mapping was submitted but was not completed.  |
| ZED Digital | RFP Section 3.1.11, California Civil Rights Laws | Administrative  | California Civil Rights Laws form was submitted without the Bidder Name section filled in. |
| ZED Digital | RFP Section 3.1.12, Iran Contracting Act | Administrative  | Iran Contracting Act form was not submitted with Proposal.  |
| Ask-int Tag, LLC dba Paragon ID | RFP Section 3.1.1.1,Category A Products and Services (M – Category A only) | Technical  | Standalone Validators (M) do not meet the requirements as specified in Attachment 7, Exhibit A – Scope of Work and Exhibit A.2 PAD Specifications.  |
| Masabi, Inc. | RFP Section 3.1.1.1,Category A Products and Services (M – Category A only) | Technical | Standalone Validators (M) do not meet the requirements as specified in Attachment 7, Exhibit A – Scope of Work and Exhibit A.2 PAD Specifications. |
| Vix Technology (USA), Inc. | RFP Section 3.1.1.1,Category A Products and Services (M – Category A only) | Technical | Standalone Validators (M) do not meet the requirements as specified in Attachment 7, Exhibit A – Scope of Work and Exhibit A.2 PAD Specifications. |
| ZED Digital | RFP Section 3.1.1.1,Category A Products and Services (M – Category A only) | Technical | Standalone Validators (M) do not meet the requirements as specified in Attachment 7, Exhibit A – Scope of Work and Exhibit A.2 PAD Specifications. |

Category B

The following deviations were deemed material, therefore considered non-compliant.

| Bidder | Category B Requirement | Administrative or Technical Deviation | Bidder Response or Material Deviation |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ask-int Tag, LLC dba Paragon ID | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative  | Two (2) of the three (3) Customer References did not respond within five (5) business days after request by the State. |
| Masabi, Inc. | RFP Section 3.1.15, Federal Transit Administration Requirements (M) | Administrative | Attachment 6 – Federal Certification Form of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension, (Nonprocurement) was signed by the Subcontractor. |
| Modeshift, LLC. | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative | One (1) of the three (3) Customer References did not respond within five (5) business days after request by the State. |
| Parkeon, Inc. dba Flowbird | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative | Two (2) of the three (3) Customer References did not respond within five (5) business days after request by the State. |
| SC Soft Americas, LLC. | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative  | Three (3) Customer References received were for subcontractor.  |
| Scheidt-Bachmann USA, Inc. | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative | One (1) of the three (3) Customer References did not respond within five (5) business days after request by the State. |
| VIX Technology USA, Inc. | RFP Section 3.1.6, Customer References | Administrative | Two (2) of the three (3) Customer References did not respond within five (5) business days after request by the State. |
| ZED Digital | RFP Section 3.1.1.2, Category B Proposed Services (M – if bidding Category B) | Administrative  | Attachment 3A – Category A - Narrative Response was not submitted with Proposal. |
| ZED Digital | RFP 3.1.1.2, Category B Proposed Services (M – if bidding Category B) | Administrative  | Attachment 5B – Category B – Integration Mapping was submitted with Proposal but was not completed. |
| ZED Digital | RFP Section 3.1.11, California Civil Rights Laws | Administrative  | California Civil Rights Laws form was not submitted with Proposal. |
| ZED Digital | RFP Section 3.1.12, Iran Contracting Act | Administrative  | Iran Contracting Act form was not submitted with Proposal. |
| Masabi, Inc. | RFP Section 3.1.15, Federal Transit Administration Requirements (M) | Administrative  | Attachment 6 – Federal Certification Form of Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension, (Nonprocurement) was signed by the Subcontractor. |
| Masabi, Inc. | RFP Section, 3.1.1.2, Category B Proposed Services (M – if bidding Category B) | Technical  | Transit Processor Interface and Integration Services, Integration with Eligibility Verification (M) do not meet the requirements.  |

## 4.4 COST EVALUATION

After completion of the Administrative and Technical Evaluations, the cost envelopes of all responsive proposals were publicly opened on November 16, 2021.

For each proposal, the total evaluated bid price for Category A and/or Category B proposed on Attachment 2A Cost Workbook and Attachment 2B Cost Workbook, were verified.

The total evaluated bid price for each Category are as follows:

Category A

| Bidder | Evaluated Bid Price |
| --- | --- |
| SC Soft Americas, LLC | $1,713,200.00 |
| Kuba, Inc. | $2,215,588.14 |
| INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc | $2,415,168.00\* |

\*The INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. evaluated bid price read at the Cost Opening indicated $2,314,320.00. However, the lowest cost compliant validators were calculated to obtain the above evaluated bid price.

Category B

| Bidder | Evaluated Bid Price |
| --- | --- |
| Enghouse Transportation, LLC | $5,998,250.00 |
| Little Pay, Inc. | $9,800,000.00 |
| Bytemark, Inc. | $11,795,000.00 |
| INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc | $20,760,200.00 |

## 4.5 SCORING CRITERIA

The bidders were scored in the following two (2) categories.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring Categories | Category A Total Available Points  | Category B Total Available Points |
| Non-Cost Score(Customer References, Narrative Response, Integration Mapping) | 400 | 400 |
| Cost Score | 600 | 600 |
| Total Score | 1000 | 1000 |

## 4.6 PROPOSAL SCORES

The following table identifies compliant bidders and their total evaluated scores.

Category A:

| Bidder | Customer Reference Score (90 points) | Narrative Response (260 points) | Integration Mapping(50 points) | Cost Score(600 Points) | Total Evaluated Score |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Init Innovations in Transportation, Inc. | 80 | 160 | 14 | 425.61 | **679.61** |
| Kuba, Inc. | 72 | 180 | 22 | 463.95 | **737.95** |
| SC Soft Americas, LLC | 85 | 128 | 7 | 600 | **820** |

Category B:

| Bidder | Customer Reference Score (90 points) | Narrative Response (260 points) | Integration Mapping(50 points) | Cost Score(600 Points) | Total Evaluated Score |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bytemark, Inc. | 82 | 152 | 15 | 305.13 | **554.13** |
| Enghouse Transportation, LLC | 75 | 180 | 40 | 600 | **895.00** |
| Init Innovations in Transportation, Inc. | 72 | 136 | 15 | 173.36 | **396.36** |
| Little Pay, Inc. | 73 | 200 | 50 | 367.24 | **684.24** |

## 4.7 PREFERENCES AND INCENTIVES

In order to comply with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) solicitation requirements, the RFP did not include the Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) requirement, DVBE incentive, Small Business (SB) Preference, and the Target Area Contract Preference Act (TACPA).

# **SUMMARY**

The Evaluation Team verified the following information:

* Each proposed awardee was determined responsible.
* Each proposed awardee was determined responsive.
* The Bidders were all judged to have bid independently.
* Based on the analysis of the pricing, the pricing is fair and reasonable.
* The proposed awardees meet or exceed the technical requirements.

# **RECOMMENDATION**

In accordance with RFP Section 6.4, Selection and Award, the Evaluation Team recommends the following awards:

Category A:

| Bidder |
| --- |
| INIT Innovations in Transportation, LLC |
| Kuba, Inc. |
| SC Soft Americas, LLC  |

Category B:

| Bidder |
| --- |
| Bytemark, Inc. |
| Enghouse Transportation, LLC  |
| INIT Innovations in Transportation, LLC  |
| Little Pay, Inc.  |

\*\*\*\*\*