

**REPORT FROM EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR  
TRANSIT MOBILE TICKETING SOLUTION - RFP NO. 9544**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

SUSAN ROGERS – IT Supervisor, Fresno Area Express  
JEFF LONG – Planning Department, Fresno Area Express  
ZACHARY SERRANO – Information Services Supervisor, City of Fresno  
JOEY MELENDRES – ISD Senior Network Systems Specialist, City of Fresno  
PEDRO BRAZ – ISD Programmer/Analyst IV, City of Fresno  
JAMIE GIBSON-BARROWS – Independent Living Skills Instructor, Valley Center  
for the Blind

**FACILITATOR**

SANDRA GAMEZ – Senior Procurement Specialist, Department of Finance

**BACKGROUND**

Fresno Area Express (FAX) has issued this Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals for a Transit Mobile Ticketing Solution to implement on both its fixed-route and Paratransit services.

FAX solicited for a transit Mobile Ticketing Solution that would provide convenient fare payment options, enhancing customer service, by reducing boarding delays due to cash fare payment, and reduce operational cost associated with processing cash transactions.

At a minimum, the solution was required to include a smartphone mobile ticketing platform, however, a system that includes both mobile ticketing and smart card payments will be considered. An additional benefit would have been a solution that obtained data that would help FAX learn about ridership patterns and customer preferences.

FAX was searching for proposals from qualified firms to implement a turnkey transit Mobile Ticketing System. The solution will include design, hosting, manufacturing, testing, delivery, site preparation, installation, associated hardware, software, communications, all system interfaces. The solution will include all system components, associated support, operations, maintenance, licenses, and training.

The solution was to consist of all labor, materials, tools and equipment required for procurement and installation, as well as all bonds, permits, and insurance necessary for this project and as required by Federal and State Laws and City Ordinances. The proposed solution must meet all applicable Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and standards.

Proposals were solicited for this project on May 22, 2020, and advertised in the Fresno Business Journal and Mass Transit Magazine. The Request for Proposals was sent to

**REPORT FROM EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR  
TRANSIT MOBILE TICKETING SOLUTION - RFP NO. 9544**

three building exchanges and specifications were distributed to forty-two potential bidders. The bids were publicly opened on August 4, 2020.

Proposals were submitted by eight vendors on August 4, 2020.

**SIGNIFICANT EVENTS**

May 22, 2019	Bid Release
August 4, 2020	Bid Opening
August 14, 2020	Committee Meeting
August 18, 2020	Committee Meeting
August 20, 2020	Committee Meeting
August 25, 2020	Scoring Summary Meeting
September 3, 2020	Demo Meeting (DART, Genfare, Masabi)
September 4, 2020	Demo Meeting (ZED Digital, Delerrok, Flowbird, American Eagle, and Token Transit)
January 7, 2021	Committee Evaluations

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

FAX's solicitation included the following five evaluation criteria ranked in order of relative importance:

**1. Proposed Solution**

The Selection Committee will evaluate the Contractors approach to its Mobile Ticketing Solution to include its features/abilities and components as well as the process of how Contractor will implement, integrate and rollout the solution.

**2. Cost**

The Selection Committee will evaluate the Contractor's proposed costs.

**3. Management and Technical Competence**

The quality of the Proposer's Key Personnel and its technical and support resources to assure satisfactory performance of all Contract services. This factor will include review and evaluation of the Key Personnel and the commitment of the Key Personnel to the Project; the Proposer's approach to management of the services; and the Proposer's strategies or concepts for enhancing service quality, productivity, and performance.

**4. Completeness of Response**

Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions; exceptions to or deviations from the RFP requirements that the Agency cannot or will not accommodate; and any other relevant factors not considered elsewhere.

**5. Qualifications, Related Experience, and References**

Technical experience in performing work of a closely similar nature; experience working with public agencies; experience in providing specifically this type of service, strength and stability of the firm; strength, stability, experience, and technical competence of sub-contractors; assessment by client references; references with demonstrated success in providing similar services.

## COMMITTEE NOTES

*AmericanEagle.com* – This establishment is a transit technology firm with experience in websites, online web portals for transit fare payment systems, mobile ticketing systems and smart card solutions. The committee deemed this vendor as highly qualified in the field of mobile ticketing and fare collection with extensive knowledge and experience with large agencies. AmericanEagle.com met all the proposal requirements but did not provide a customer service solution that was feasible for FAX to implement.

*Cubic/Dellerrok*, - This establishment is a transit technology firm specializing in fare payment solutions with experience in account-based fare payment and other revenue cloud-based electronic fare payment solutions including mobile ticketing. The consensus is this vendor is highly qualified in the field of mobile ticketing and fare collection with extensive knowledge and experience with large agencies. Cubic/Dellerock met all the proposal requirements but did not offer a customer service solution that was feasible for FAX to implement.

*DART* – This transit technology firm specializes in fare payment solutions through an application solution. The general committee determined that DART was limited in its experience in the mobile ticketing platform but has extensive experience within the transit arena. DART met most of the proposal requirements but did not meet the requirement of having a means to provide a non-visual validation of tickets.

*Genfare* - This transit technology firm specializes in fare payment solutions with experience in account-based fare payment and other revenue cloud-based electronic fare payment solutions including mobile ticketing. The committee's consensus is this vendor is highly qualified in the field of mobile ticketing and fare collection with extensive knowledge and experience with large agencies. Genfare met all the proposal requirements but did not have a customer service solution that was feasible for FAX to implement.

*Masabi* - This establishment is a transit technology firm specializing in fare payment solutions with experience in account-based fare payment and other revenue cloud-based electronic fare payment solutions including mobile ticketing. The consensus is this vendor is highly qualified in the field of mobile ticketing and fare collection with extensive knowledge and experience with large agencies. Masabi met all the proposal requirements but did not have a customer service solution that was feasible for FAX to implement.

*Parkeon Flowbird* - This establishment is a transit technology firm specializing in fare payment solutions with experience in account-based fare payment and other revenue cloud-based electronic fare payment solutions including mobile ticketing. This vendor is highly qualified in the field of mobile ticketing and fare collection with extensive knowledge and experience with large agencies. Parkeon Flowbird met all of the proposal requirements but did not have a customer service solution that was feasible for FAX to implement.

*Token Transit* - This establishment is a transit technology firm specializing in fare payment solutions with experience in account-based fare payment solutions including mobile ticketing. The committee unanimously agreed this vendor to be highly qualified in the field of mobile ticketing with extensive knowledge and experience with small and large agencies. Token Transit met all of the proposal's requirements with the exception of being able to fully integrate their proposed solution with the City's merchant of record which is a determining factor.

*ZED Digital* - This establishment is a transit technology firm specializing in fare payment solutions with experience in account-based fare payment and other revenue cloud-based electronic fare payment solutions including of which is mobile ticketing. The general consensus was that this vendor is highly qualified in the field of mobile ticketing and fare collection with extensive knowledge and experience with large agencies. ZED met all of the proposals requirements but did not have a customer service solution that was feasible for FAX to implement and did not clearly state the requirements of FAX for their solution to fully integrate with the City's existing merchant of record.

## **SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION**

The City received eight (8) responses to the solicitation. After independent evaluation of the proposals, using the evaluation criteria noted above, the evaluation committee unanimously determined that the most qualified proposers greatly exceeds budget appropriations. Additionally, proposers were unable to meet the requirements of the RFP to include requirements for existing merchant of record, the ability to comply with on-board visual and non-visual validation of tickets, and a feasible customer service solution. It is the judgement and recommendation of this committee that it is in the best interest of the City to reject all bids and re-bid RFP with revised specifications.