

**City of Seattle RFP #FAS-235 - Vehicle Impound Management Services
Overview of Proposal Evaluation**

Proposals will be evaluated in the primary sections shown below with their importance weights:

- **Minimum Qualifications (pass/fail), Technical Response (500 points), Management Response (150 points), Pricing Response (250 points), and (optional) Interview and Technology Demonstration (pass/fail; if pass, maximum of 200 points).**
- **The total possible score for a vendor is 1,100 points with optional interview and technology demonstration**

The Pass/Fail Minimum Qualifications will be evaluated by the Buyer with the assistance of the Project Manager and any technical experts. If the vendor passes all of the minimum qualifications, the proposal will be further evaluated by the evaluation team, who will then score the Technical Response, the Management Response, and the (optional) Interview.

The **Technical Response** will be evaluated using the answers provided in the vendor's response to the RFP.

The Technical Response accounts for **500** points of the overall score. The purpose of the technical response is to evaluate how a vendor addresses critical areas of vehicle impounds and related services - customer service, information technology, legal issues, cost issues, subcontracting, and storage lot(s) and release facility. A high scoring vendor will show a commitment to meeting the City's goals in an area like response times; will have well developed policies and procedures in place to address customer service, legal, cost, and other issues; and will demonstrate a willingness to invest in the staff, trucks, equipment, and lot/facility needed for successful operation.

The **Management Response** will be evaluated using the answers provided in the vendor's response to the RFP.

The Management Response accounts for **150** points of the overall score. The purpose of the management response is to evaluate a vendor's viability and propensity to perform and relative risk to the City, experience in dealing with contracts of similar size and scope, qualifications and skill sets of key staff, and approach to implementing the contract. A high scoring vendor will demonstrate considerable experience in and knowledge of municipal impound operations, show the ability to prioritize the City's project, and present a well developed implementation plan with the appropriate project team.

The **Pricing Response** will be evaluated using the bids provided in the vendor's response to the RFP.

The Pricing Response accounts for **250** points of the overall score. The vendor with the lowest price for a Class A impound will be given the maximum number of points (125) and all other vendors will receive a smaller number of points as determined by the ratio of their prices to the least expensive proposal. The vendor with the lowest price for a 12-hour storage increment for a vehicle under 20 feet will be given the maximum number of points (100) and all other vendors will receive a smaller number of points as determined by the ratio of their prices to the least expensive proposal. Finally, the vendor with the lowest price for boot return will be given the maximum number of points (25) and all other vendors will receive a smaller number of points as determined by the ratio of their prices to the least expensive proposal.

The optional **Interview and Technology Demonstration** will be evaluated using a script of questions developed by the evaluation team.

The optional Interview and Technology Demonstration is first evaluated on a pass/fail basis. If a vendor passes, then a maximum **200** points will be added to the vendor's overall score. Only the highest ranked vendors will be invited to Seattle for interviews and technology demonstrations. The purpose of the interview and technology demonstration is to provide an opportunity for the evaluation team to ask questions on areas of the vendor's written response (to the RFP) that were lacking sufficient detail, not clearly presented, etc. and to view the vendor's information management system. A high scoring vendor will have deep knowledge of its proposal and related issues and be able to effectively convey that knowledge during the interview and technology demonstration.

City of Seattle RFP #FAS-235 - Vehicle Impound Management Services
Overview of Proposal Evaluation

Below is an example of scoring for Vendor A and Vendor B. In this example, Vendor B earns the higher score.

Technical Response

	Max. points	Vendor A	Vendor B
TOTAL	500	350	400

Management Response

	Max. points	Vendor A	Vendor B
TOTAL	150	130	115

Pricing Response

	Max. points	Vendor A	Vendor B	Lowest Fee
1. Class A impound fee	125	\$125.00	\$122.00	\$122.00
Bid Score as % of Lowest Bid		98%	100%	
<i>Bid score weighted (max = 100)</i>		122	125	
2. 12-hour storage fee for vehicles under 20'	100	\$13.00	\$11.00	\$11.00
Bid Score as % of Lowest Bid		85%	100%	
<i>Bid score weighted (max = 100)</i>		85	100	
3. Boot return fee	25	\$7.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
Bid Score as % of Lowest Bid		71%	100%	
<i>Bid score weighted (max = 50)</i>		18	25	
TOTAL	250	224	250	

Interview and Technology Demonstration (option exercised; both vendors pass)

	Max. points	Vendor A	Vendor B
TOTAL	200	180	150

Overall Score

	Max. points	Vendor A	Vendor B
TOTAL	1100	884	915

Scoring Summary						
	Max. Points	ABC	AutoReturn	Lang	Lincoln	UR VMS
I. Minimum Qualifications	PASS/FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	PASS	FAIL
II. Technical Response	500	444	0	285	434	0
III. Management Response	150	124	0	72	142	0
IV. Pricing Response	250	159	0	250	178	0
Subtotal	900	727	0	607	754	0
V. Interview and Technology Demonstration (optional)	PASS/FAIL	PASS			PASS	
	200	188	0	0	180	0
Total	1,100	915	0	607	934	0
RANKING		2			1	

I. Minimum Qualifications						
	Max. Points	ABC	AutoReturn	Lang	Lincoln	UR VMS
1. Vendor will own, lease, or subcontract at least one (1) primary storage lot and release facility located within the Seattle city limits at time of proposal submittal. The total area of the primary storage lot and release facility and any secondary storage lot(s) must be no less than 125,000 square feet.	PASS/FAIL	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS
2. Vendor must be a Registered Tow Truck Operator in the State of Washington at time of proposal submittal. Any secondary licensing such as a Registered Tow Truck Operator Branch license may be obtained prior to contract award.	PASS/FAIL	PASS	FAIL	PASS	PASS	FAIL
3. Vendor will identify subcontractors that are Registered Tow Truck Operators at the time of proposal submittal and that vendor intends to use to fulfill the City's statement of work. Vendor will propose as many subcontractors as prudent given its ability to manage such subcontractors.	PASS/FAIL	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS
4. Each subcontractor identified by vendor will have a minimum of three years experience in towing vehicles.	PASS/FAIL	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS

II. Technical Response					
Area	Element	Max. Points	ABC	Lang	Lincoln
CUSTOMER SERVICE	1. Proposed average minimum response time for a Class A impound	15	15	12	12
	2. 24x7 availability and response	15	15	15	15
	3. Definition of customer service	15	12	15	15
	4. Communication channels with City remain open and effective	15	15	6	15
	5. Complaint and problem resolution and management escalation plan	15	15	9	12
	6. Plan to serve non-English speakers	5	5	5	5
	7. Plan to serve persons with disabilities	5	5	5	5
	8. Plan for proper training and credentials for tow truck drivers	10	10	8	10
	9. Sufficient number of trucks and equipment to meet contract	10	10	6	8
	10. Dispatch closest available truck	15	15	3	12
	11. Financial ability and willingness to expand or improve	10	10	10	10
	Subtotal	130	127	94	119
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	1. Develop and implement information management system	45	32	32	36
	2. Meet all other elements in IT section of statement of work	25	10	13	15
	3. Password controls	10	8	4	7
	4. Management of updates, patches, and other security maintenance	10	8	8	7
	5. Third party testing against recognized security standard	10	5	2	3
	Subtotal	100	63	59	68
LEGAL ISSUES	1. Claims scenario	10	10	6	10
	2. Protection of the City from claims for damages	10	10	4	10
	3. Protection of the City from claims for theft or loss	10	10	2	10
	4. Following of state and local laws	5	5	0	4
	5. Remediation of issues between company and City	5	4	2	5
	Subtotal	40	39	14	39

II. Technical Response					
Area	Element	Max. Points	ABC	Lang	Lincoln
COST ISSUES	1. Ability to stay within the City's pre-established pricing schemes and fulfill the statement of work	15	15	12	15
	2. Containment of costs to vehicle owners	15	15	12	12
	3. Additional costs or savings not reflected in the Pricing Response that the City might incur or realize through the contract	10	10	0	10
	Subtotal	40	40	24	37
SUBCONTRACTING	1. General approach to subcontracting, management abilities fitting the City's needs, and proposed percentages of work performed by self and by subcontractors	25	10	10	20
	2. Methodology to ensure equitable distribution of work and perceived favoritism is mitigated	25	25	10	25
	3. Management practices and controls used for subcontractors	20	20	0	16
	4. Steps to resolve disputes with subcontractors	20	20	8	16
	Subtotal	90	75	28	77
STORAGE LOT(S) AND RELEASE FACILITY	1. Clean, well-organized, secure, and effectively managed storage lot/release facility	40	40	24	40
	2. Storage lot/release facility accessibility	30	30	18	24
	3. Specific documentation and details on storage lot/release facility	30	30	24	30
	Subtotal	100	100	66	94
	Grand Total	500	444	285	434
NOTES					
Customer Service	<p>ABC: overall, vendor provided strong responses with the exception of question three where the City would have liked more detail; vendor proposed the lowest average minimum response time and greatest fleet size of the three proposals evaluated</p> <p>Lang: overall, vendor provided a mix of strong, fair, and poor responses; the response on dispatching the closest available truck was unclear and the vendor did not provide any documentation to substantiate the availability of credit to finance the expansion/improvement of operations</p> <p>Lincoln: overall, vendor provided strong responses; the City would have liked more detail in vendor's responses to questions five and ten</p>				
Information Technology	<p>ABC: overall, IT section was not well organized; evaluators had difficulty locating vendor's responses, despite the reference guide provided; many of the examples provided, while interesting, did not address issues directly asked by the City</p> <p>Lang: overall, responses were relatively solid though some (e.g., security practices and vendor's ability to meet the City's statement of IT work) lacked the depth and technical detail desired by the evaluators; level of familiarity between Lang's and DTS' teams was unclear</p> <p>Lincoln: overall, responses to questions were strong; lack of technical detail on vendor's ability to meet the City's IT statement of work and on security testing resulted in lower scores on questions two and five</p>				
Legal Issues	<p>ABC: overall, vendor provided strong responses</p> <p>Lang: vendor's responses were insufficient and did not demonstrate an understanding of questions</p> <p>Lincoln: overall, vendor provided strong responses</p>				
Cost Issues	<p>ABC: overall, vendor provided strong responses</p> <p>Lang: overall, vendor provided relatively strong responses, but seemed to misunderstand question three; City was unsure of whether DTS' fee of \$10 is included in vendor's bid for a class A impound or would be a separate charge due upon vehicle redemption (the latter would not be allowed under a City contract)</p> <p>Lincoln: overall, vendor provided strong responses; the City would have liked greater detail in vendor's response to how it would contain costs to vehicle owners</p>				

II. Technical Response					
Area	Element	Max. Points	ABC	Lang	Lincoln
Subcontracting	ABC: overall, vendor provided strong responses, with the exception of question one; the City specifically asked for percentages to be provided and the vendor did not provide them				
	Lang: overall, vendor provided fair to poor responses; the vendor did not discuss any management practices and controls that it would use with its subcontractors				
	Lincoln: overall, vendor provided strong responses, though responses to questions three and four could have been more thoughtful; vendor should have been more straightforward in presenting the percentages of work directed to companies owned by RoadOne West				
Storage Lot(s) and Release Facility	ABC: overall, vendor provided strong responses and all documentation requested				
	Lang: overall, vendor provided fair responses; the vendor did not include any zoning documentation as requested				
	Lincoln: overall, vendor provided strong responses and all documentation requested; vendor's facility at Pasadena PI N is not as accessible as storage lot locations proposed by other vendors; City would have liked to know more about vendor's plans to use a storage lot in South Seattle				

III. Management Response				
	Max. Points	ABC	Lang	Lincoln
1. Company Experience	10	10	4	10
2. Company Organization	5	5	1	5
3. Financial Information	20	20	20	16
4. Current Commitments	10	10	10	10
5. Previous Experience and References	20	20	12	20
6. Terminations	5	5	5	5
7. Prime Contractor	20	4	4	20
8. Project Manager Experience	10	10	2	10
9. Key Staff Roles and Responsibilities	10	8	2	10
10. Key Staff Experience and Location	10	10	0	10
11. Key Staff Assignment Priority	10	6	0	10
12. Proposed Approach to Implementing Contract	20	16	12	16
Total	150	124	72	142
NOTES				
Company Experience	ABC: good			
	Lang: contract with City would be vendor's largest and most complex of those contracts currently held			
	Lincoln: good			
Company Organization	ABC: good			
	Lang: vendor did not provide a current organizational chart; it only provided one for DTS			
	Lincoln: good			
Financial Information	ABC: information provided did not suggest any significant financial risks			
	Lang: information provided did not suggest any significant financial risks			
	Lincoln: while information provided did not suggest any significant financial risks, the City would like to have reviewed numbers specific to Lincoln (as opposed to RoadOne West)			
Current Commitments	ABC: information provided did not suggest any current commitments would impede work on City's contract			
	Lang: information provided did not suggest any current commitments would impede work on City's contract			
	Lincoln: information provided did not suggest any current commitments would impede work on City's contract			
Previous Experience and References	ABC: good			
	Lang: vendor has not held any contracts that would be as large and complex as the City's			
	Lincoln: good			

III. Management Response				
Terminations	ABC: vendor not terminated from any contract			
	Lang: vendor not terminated from any contract			
	Lincoln: vendor not terminated from any contract			
Prime Contractor	ABC: vendor's subcontracting plan did not provide sufficient detail on the information requested by the City			
	Lang: vendor's subcontracting plan was unclear			
	Lincoln: good			
Project Manager Experience	ABC: good			
	Lang: vendor's project manager has no experience with managing large, complex contracts			
	Lincoln: good			
Key Staff Roles and Responsibilities	ABC: good; however, vendor would need to fill several positions, some of which seem more critical than others			
	Lang: proposal does not clearly lay out the responsibilities for vendor's key staff			
	Lincoln: good			
Key Staff Experience and Location	ABC: good			
	Lang: not addressed in proposal			
	Lincoln: good			
Key Staff Assignment and Priority	ABC: City can assume that its contract would be vendor's priority, but vendor did not explicitly state this in proposal			
	Lang: not addressed in proposal			
	Lincoln: good			
Proposed Approach to Implementing Contract	ABC: vendor proposes a very short timeline for transition, which could be problematic given the succession of tasks that need to be completed before vendor is fully up and running			
	Lang: vendor did not provide a Gantt chart or similar with its proposed timeline for transition and implementing the new contract			
	Lincoln: vendor did not explain why it needs the number of days proposed to transition and implement the new contract nor did it satisfactorily explain the City resources needed during the transition			

IV. Pricing Response				
	Max. Points	ABC	Lang	Lincoln
1. Class A Impound Fee (assume 16,800 impounds/year)		\$ 1,848,000.00	\$ 1,058,232.00	\$ 1,806,000.00
Points	125	71.58	125	73.24
2. 12-Hour Storage Rate (assume 121,700 12-hour storage increments/year)		\$ 1,947,200.00	\$ 1,217,000.00	\$ 1,521,250.00
Points	100	62.5	100	80
3. Boot Return Fee (assume 1,900 boot returns/year)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Points	25	25	25	25
Total	250	159	250	178

V. Interview and Technology Demonstration (optional)			
	Max. Points	ABC	Lincoln
If vendor passes, then award points	PASS/FAIL	PASS	PASS
	200	188	180
Total	200	188	180

	Max. Points	ABC	NOTES
Interview Questions			
1. Transition period	10	6	Schedule seemed too short given the work to be done, assumed work would occur 24 hours per day, and did not have any contingencies built into it
2. Transition challenges	5	3	Response lacked sufficient detail on overcoming hiring challenges
3. Org. chart and communication paths	5	5	Good
4. Subcontractor use of storage lot(s)	10	8	Until asked, response lacked sufficient detail on how a lot used by multiple subcontractors would comply with State law
5. Service delivery under extreme conditions	5	5	Good
6. Role as prime contractor	10	6	Response lacked sufficient detail on how guiding principles would translate into practice and on the trust needed between the prime and its subcontractors
7. Percentages of subcontracted work	10	10	Good
8. Commitment to accuracy and audits	5	5	Good
9. Performance measurement	5	5	Good
10. City tow company licenses	5	5	Good
11. Customer service definition and practice	5	5	Good
12. City contract priority	5	5	Good

V. Interview and Technology Demonstration (optional)			
SUBTOTAL	80	68	
Technology Demonstration and Questions			
1. Business	40	40	Good response particularly in the areas of customization, user-friendliness, and ability to track why a call was rejected by a truck
2. Technical	40	40	Good response highlighted by strong password controls, minimal APIs, daily site scan, and an application type that allows for easier patching
SUBTOTAL	80	80	
Quality of Presentation and Communication	40	40	Good on both materials presented and quality of communication
SUBTOTAL	40	40	
TOTAL	200	188	

	Max. Points	Lincoln	NOTES
Interview Questions			
1. Transition period	10	10	Good
2. Transition challenges	5	4	Response lacked sufficient detail on flexibility regarding staffing levels
3. Subcontractor use of storage lot(s)	10	10	Good
4. South Seattle storage lot	5	3	While response identified a preferred site, it did not consider other sites in South Seattle that could, for example, be more conveniently located

V. Interview and Technology Demonstration (optional)			
5. Service delivery under extreme conditions	5	5	Good
6. Role as prime contractor	5	5	Good
7. Percentages of subcontracted work	10	10	Good
8. Subcontractor disciplinary process	10	6	Response lacked sufficient detail on specific steps that would be taken if performance does not meet expectations
9. Performance measurement	5	5	Good
10. City tow company licenses	5	4	Response lacked sufficient detail on which companies currently identified as subcontractors are licensed and which are not
11. Accountability, equity, and transparency	5	5	Good
12. Contain vehicle owner costs	5	5	Good
SUBTOTAL	80	72	
Technology Demonstration and Questions			
1. Business	40	36	Good response highlighted by effective integration of photos and electronic signatures and user-friendliness of the various interfaces; points deducted because system did not have a tool to record activities in the system (e.g., an audit log)

V. Interview and Technology Demonstration (optional)			
			Response noted that no security testing has been done yet, handheld devices may require mobile data management, options are more limited for regularly updating operating system and device, system events are not logged, and mobile application works only on the Android platform
2. Technical	40	32	
SUBTOTAL	80	68	
Quality of Presentation and Communication	40	40	Good on both materials presented and quality of communication
SUBTOTAL	40	40	
TOTAL	200	180	