

14. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND BASIS FOR AWARD

BEST VALUE

Introduction

Technical proposals for WMATA's Faregate Acquisition will be evaluated based on their responsiveness to WMATA's key objectives and requirements and demonstrated experience and qualifications to successfully delivery all Contract elements.

Proposals will first be evaluated on compliance with critical functionality to identify proposals that are unacceptable or non-responsive. Proposals that do deliver critical requirements will be considered non-responsible and will not be considered further. For those critical requirements to which the Offeror provides an explanation in impact assessment of any work around for a critical requirement or functionality, WMATA will evaluate the supplemental information before assessing the proposal as non-responsive.

The Offeror shall be responsible for the design, delivery, testing and deployment of all system hardware including faregate cabinets, station terminals, station manager portable devices, central system hardware or modifications, and all connecting cables, tools and equipment needed to deliver and install the system. Offerors will have the option of proposing multiple faregate solutions for consideration as part of this procurement.

The principle project constraints are:

- Interfacing with WMATA's current fare payment system;
- Meeting aesthetic requirements to be complimentary to station's historical design which have landmark protections;
- Deploying equipment within WMATA's existing power and communication raceways and interfaces;
- Interfacing with station emergency alarm system; and
- Deploying equipment without disrupting revenue service or creating transition issues for WMATA's customers.

The desired vendor would have extensive experience and expertise in delivering large AFC programs and sufficient resources to mobilize the staff with specialized expertise to support the project.

Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated based on responsiveness of approach to technical requirements (Technical Proposal) and costs (Cost Proposal), with the greater consideration for the Technical Proposal.

There are two tiers of Technical Proposal evaluation criteria:

- Critical Requirements – these requirements are critical to the project. Proposals that fail to meet these requirements will not be considered.
- Technical Evaluation Criteria – these are the general proposal requirements that will be scored based on the Proposer's Technical Proposal, as described in Section 1.3.

The Critical Requirements and Technical Evaluation Criteria, including the scoring associated with each element of the Technical Proposal, are described below.

Critical Requirements

Certain requirements are considered critical to the project, and proposals that fail to demonstrate compliance with these requirements will not be considered. These critical requirements, numbered 1 through 8, are all equally weighted, scored on a pass/fail basis and include the ability to:

1. Integrate the Cubic TR-4 Payment Processing Target into faregate design and support defined systems integration process and requirements.
2. Integrate the Cubic Payment Validator with the Station Terminal device supporting systems integration processes and requirements.
3. Comply with all applicable federal and industry standards including ADA, NFPA 130, NFPA 70, PCI, and Title VI.
4. Provide secure data storage and communications that includes user and device authentication protocols.
5. Support local, central and portable faregate management.
6. Support emergency safety functionality including the automatic opening faregate barriers and activation of emergency lighting with the loss of power or with the triggering of WMATA's emergency alarm system and the automatic retraction or opening of barriers when obstructed
7. Achieve passenger throughput of at least 35 ingress or egress transactions per minute through the faregate.
8. Provide a maintenance service option that meets staffing and performance requirements.

Technical Evaluation Criteria

Technical proposals will be assessed based on:

1. Technical Approach: the proposed solution approach, including adherence to technical requirements and ability of the proposed solution to address WMATA objectives;
2. Deployment Approach: specifically, the efficiency and effectiveness of the deployment approach;
3. Qualifications: the experience and qualifications of the team;
4. Design Aesthetic: the quality of the design aesthetic as it relates to the Metrorail environment;
5. Sustainability: the impact of reducing power consumption for the proposed solution;
6. Quality of Maintenance Plan: the quality of the proposed maintenance service option; and
7. Enhanced Functionality: Additional consideration (up to 5 bonus points) will be given to proposals that provide enhanced functionality not specifically identified as a proposal requirement, but that provides benefit to WMATA operations and maintenance.

Technical Proposals will be scored as shown in the table below.

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Approach	Score Range	Minimum Acceptable Score
1. Technical Approach	Based on description of proposed solution and responses to WMATA requirements compliance matrix, including Offeror's confirmation of delivery of requirements or equivalent functionality and demonstrated understanding of requirements.	0 to 30	20

2. Deployment Approach	Based on the description of the proposed deployment approach, understanding of deployment requirements and system constraints, and the impact of the deployment on WMATA operations and support requirements.	0 to 30	20
3. Qualifications	Based on minimum past performance requirements and expertise in all areas of contract delivery including: project management, design, system integration, manufacturing, training, deployment and maintenance.	0 to 15	10
4. Design Aesthetic	Based on compliance with WMATA finishing requirements, the compatibility of accent coloring and designs with WMATA's historic design, and overall aesthetic quality.	0 to 10	7
5. Sustainability	Based on potential reduction of power usage to operate faregates relative to power draws of current equipment, as described in Section 1.1.3 of the RFP.	0 to 5	3
6. Quality of Maintenance Plan	Based on reasonableness and demonstrated ability to meet requirements for these services, should WMATA choose to implement this contract option.	0 to 10	7
Base Score:		Up to 100	67
7. Enhanced Functionality	Bonus Points may be added based on the assessed utility of the enhancement to WMATA operations and the customer experience or impact on safety.	0 to 5	0
Base and Bonus Score:		Up to 105	67

Each evaluation item must have been scored at or above the Minimum Acceptable Score to be acceptable. A total overall score at or below 66 will be considered Marginal; a total score between 67 and 80 will be considered Acceptable and a total score above 80 will be considered Exceptional. Proposals must be rated as Acceptable or Exceptional for further consideration. Bonus points will not be applied to the calculation of the minimum acceptable score; further bonus points will be used as a tie-breaker in the event that one or more proposals are rated equally against the base criteria. .

Proposers may submit multiple hardware-based solutions that satisfy the requirements. Each proposed solution will be scored separately. Proposers may also include options within a single solution as long as there is no price variation associated with the selection of one option over another. For example, Offeror may propose two different designs for the design of faregate accent pieces. If the cost for both designs is the same the proposal will be scored as a single solution. Alternatively, if the Offeror proposes two different grades of stainless steel and there is a cost difference between the two, then the Offeror should present these as two different options and should complete two separate cost proposals.

The Authority will award a contract to the responsible offeror whose proposal conforms to the solicitation and is judged to be the most advantageous to the Authority based on an overall assessment of technical merit and price in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria. The Authority is more concerned with obtaining superior technical or business management features than with making an award at the lowest overall cost to the Authority. However, the Authority will not make an award at a significantly higher overall cost to achieve only slightly superior technical or management features.