

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**  
**Office of Contracting and Procurement**



**COUNCIL CONTRACT SUMMARY**

Pursuant to section 202(c) of the Procurement Practices Reform Act of 2010, effective April 8, 2011 (D.C. Law 18-371; D.C. Official Code §2-352.02), the following contract summary is provided:

**(A) The proposed contractor, contract amount, unit and method of compensation, contract term, and type of contract:**

<b>Proposed Contractor:</b>	Ratp Dev McDonald Transit (RDMT) Operation & Maintenance of DC Streetcar System
<b>Contract Amount:</b>	\$20,984,555.00
<b>Unit and Method of Compensation:</b>	Payment to the contractor is on a fixed-price based on an hourly rate
<b>Term of Contract:</b>	Five (5) Years
<b>Type of Contract:</b>	Fixed Price with a Cost Reimbursement Component Contract and Not-To-Exceed Amount for Subcontractor Costs

**(B) The goods or services to be provided, the methods of delivering goods or services, and any significant program changes reflected in the proposed contract:**

The District Department of Transportation (DDOT) required the services under the proposed contract for Streetcar operations and maintenance which shall include responsibility for all day-to-day functions associated with the operation of the line: streetcar operation, service dispatch and management, hiring and training of staff, safety programs, maintenance of vehicles, maintenance of way, maintenance of facilities and systems, support for emergency response, customer service, provision of special services as required, assistance and participation in system testing and start-up activities, and administrative and recordkeeping functions.

**(C) The selection process, including the number of offerors, the evaluation criteria, and the evaluation results, including the price and technical components:**

A Request for Proposals was posted to both the DDOT and OCP Websites on August 12, 2011. The due date for submissions was Wednesday, October 12, 2011. However, upon issuance of eleven (11) amendments to the solicitation, the receipt was ultimately changed to Thursday, December 29, 2011. Nineteen (19) firms attended a pre-proposal conference on August 30, 2011 and the streetcar system was presented to attendees and questions answered.

The evaluation criteria for the proposals are evaluated based on the technical evaluation factors listed in the Solicitation for Request for Proposals (RFP). Numeric scoring was used to evaluate the proposals.

The following list provides the number of points given for each factor and sub-factor:

<b>Sub-factor</b>	<b>Score</b>
Management, Organization and Staffing	30
Approach to Operations	15
Approach to Vehicle Maintenance	15
Price Criterion	40
Total	100

The selection committee panel was established by the Contracting Officer and was comprised of five (5) voting District Department of Transportation (DDOT) staff. The committee members all signed the Conflict of Interest and Non-Disclosure Statements and were given instructions on the process of evaluating the offeror's proposal in an objective manner for compliance with the request for proposal's Statement of Work.

The DDOT/Office of Contracting and Procurement staff informed the committee of the process and duties of the Selection Committee. The procurement staff explained the duties of the chairperson, the disclosure statement and identified any potential conflicts of interest that might jeopardize the source selection process. The Committee was reminded that each criterion must be evaluated solely on the offeror technical response and that offeror proposals could not be compared with one another.

Proposals were received in the Office of Contracting and Procurement, 55 M Street, S.E., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Washington, DC no later than 2:00 p.m. on December 29, 2011. Listed below are the two (2) firms who responded to the solicitation:

Capital Traction and Electric  
Ratp Dev McDonald Transit, LLC

Only one proposal was evaluated as they were responsive to the RFP and acknowledged receipt of all amendments. The other offeror's (Capital Traction and Electrical) proposal was rejected as it did not meet the RFP criteria. The project's period of performance initially shall be for five (5) years from date of award specified on the cover page of the contract.

The evaluation committee met independently and as a group to review the submission. An interview was held with the prospective firm to discuss their proposal on January 27, 2012. After the meeting, the committee compiled their comments and requested clarification on some of the technical issues (2/15/12) and the firm responded to these concerns on 2/29/12). Once an extensive review was performed of these responses, the Contracting Officer and Committee Panel prepared a request for a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) for the contractor. The firm's BAFO was reviewed and found acceptable and the Committee sent forward a selection memo to the Contracting Officer.

The result of the Evaluation Panel's scoring for Ratp Dev McDonald Transit LLC (RDMT) was 44.72 out of the 60 points for the technical portion of the proposal. This total coupled with the 40% criteria makes the score for RDMT 84.72 of the 100 points allowed.

The ratings that were used by the Technical Review Team during the proposal evaluation process are noted above and the result is as follows:

**Ratp Dev McDonald Transit LLC**

<b>Criteria</b>						<b>Total Average Score</b>
Management, Organization and Staffing	25	20	24	23	26	23.60
Approach to Operations	7.2	6	13.2	13.2	9	9.72
Approach to Vehicle Maintenance	9	12	11	14	11	11.40
Total Scores	41.2	38	48.2	50.2	46	44.72

The committee scored the firm on its technical competence and the Contracting Officer requested a cost analysis be prepared by our Office of Contracting and Procurement to ensure the District had received a reasonable price for the services required.

A letter contract was awarded on July 6, 2012. The letter contract was further modified as follows:

- Modification #1 – Correction to first paragraph of page two of the letter contract
- Modification #2 – Extension of contract time with zero dollars added to the letter contract
- Modification #3 – Extension of contract time with zero dollars added to the letter contract
- Modification #4 – Extension of contract time with \$93,073 added to fund the letter contract through February 2013.
- Modification #5 – Extension of contract time with \$51,195 added to fund the letter contract through March 2013.
- Modification #5A – Administrative Modification Designating a new Contracting Officer

**(D) The background and qualifications of the proposed contractor, including its organization, financial stability, personnel, and prior performance on contracts with the District government:**

RDMT has the necessary organization, experience, technical skills and accounting and operational controls needed to perform the requirements of the contract as demonstrated by their satisfactory performance on the following contracts:

- Florence, Italy Streetcar (Line 1)
- Gautrain, South Africa Train and Bus Feeder Service
- Charlotte, NC Area Transit System
- Citibus in Lubbock, TX
- Bloomington, IN Bus and Paratransit System

RDMT is a privately owned company and has not previously performed operation and maintenance contracts with the District. However, this company has prior knowledge of streetcar operation and maintenance in other cities in the United States' bus and paratransit transportation systems and abroad on streetcars and bus systems. Most notably is the system they maintain in Florence, Italy where they have received satisfactory performance ratings from customers and have a 30 year contract to operate and maintain the system.

**(E) Performance standards and the expected outcome of the proposed contract:**

The contractor is required to make delivery as set forth in the scope of work as denoted in the contract. Adherence to these performance standards have and will continue to result in safe delivery of services.

**(F) A certification that the proposed contract is within the appropriated budget authority for the agency for the fiscal year and is consistent with the financial plan and budget adopted in accordance with D.C. Official Code §§ 47-392.01 and 47-392.02:**

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer has certified that the contract actions are within the appropriate budget as provided in the Financial Certification and Requisition affixed to this over \$1 million submission as Attachment E.

**(G) A certification that the proposed contract is legally sufficient, including whether the proposed contractor has any currently pending legal claims against the District:**

Certification of legal sufficiency by the Office of the Attorney General is attached.

- (H) A certification that the proposed contractor is current with its District and federal taxes or has worked out and is current with a payment schedule approved by the District or federal government:**

The contractor is in compliance with both District and Federal taxes. See Attachments C and D.

- (I) The status of the proposed contractor as a certified local, small, or disadvantaged business enterprise as defined in the Small, Local, and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Act of 2005, effective October 20, 2005 (D.C. Law 16-33; D.C. Official Code § 2-218.01 *et seq.*):**

The contractor is not a certified CBE.

- (J) Other aspects of the proposed contract that the Chief Procurement Officer considers significant:**

None

- (K) A statement indicating whether the proposed contractor is currently debarred from providing services or goods to the District or federal government, the dates of the debarment, and the reasons for debarment:**

As of February 2013, the contractor is not on the Federal or District debarment lists.

- (L) Where the contract, if executed, will be made available online:**

[http://app.ocp.dc.gov/RUI/information/scf/online\\_index.asp](http://app.ocp.dc.gov/RUI/information/scf/online_index.asp).