The Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District herewith issues this Addendum No. 6 to the above referenced Documents. Except as modified below, all other terms and conditions shall remain in effect. Strikethrough texts are words deleted from original RFP text and bold/italicized/underlined text are changes to original RFP text.

Amendments to the Request for Proposal

NONE

Amendment to the General Conditions, Instructions, and Information for Offeror

NONE

Amendments to the Special Conditions

On Page 9 of 32 of the RFP, clause 19. Evaluation Process has been replaced in its entirety. See the revised clause 19. Evaluation Process below:

19. EVALUATION PROCESS

a. All proposals are first evaluated for responsibility/responsiveness compliance with Minimum Proposal Requirements. Proposals achieving a pass rating will be evaluated further on responses to Technical and other RFP elements.

b. All proposals are evaluated and ranked on evaluation criteria specified in the RFP. Evaluation is an assessment of the proposal and the Proposer’s ability to accomplish the Scope of Services in accordance with Contract terms and conditions.

c. Technically acceptable proposals are re-evaluated with cost as a consideration.

d. Using both technical and pricing evaluation, proposals are ranked to identify a competitive range.

e. District may negotiate, or hold discussions, with all responsible Proposers in the competitive range, or award without discussion.

f. The District, at its sole discretion, may present a Best and Final Offer opportunity from which scores will be evaluated to determine best overall proposals.
### WEIGHT ASSIGNMENT FOR PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Strategy</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consumables – (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preventative Maintenance – (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Repair – (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Management – (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Replacement printers – (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional printers – (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past Performance: References</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL WEIGHT</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

g. **Award Process**

The District reserves the right to award without negotiation. Therefore, proposers are encouraged to submit their best offer initially. The District will award to the proposer whose proposal is most advantageous to the District, with cost and other factors considered. After the District’s approval of award, unsuccessful proposers will be notified of such award in a timely manner.

h. **Oral Presentations**

If necessary, at a mutually arranged time, and prior to final evaluation, oral presentations may be scheduled, and evaluated, by the Evaluation Team either at the AC Transit District’s office, via teleconference, or Skype. An oral presentation is intended to provide a full understanding of a proposal.

Note: If oral presentations are elected, presentations will be requested from all responders within the competitive range. Presentations will not be evaluated against criteria contained in the proposal evaluation chart.
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i. **Cost Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

1. In accordance with Cost Proposal Form instructions, complete all forms and respond to all requested information and documentation contained in the section.

2. Cost Proposals will be evaluated for reasonableness and effectiveness in relation to value received, using the combined total of the Contractor Services, including cost for the base period.

j. **Best Value**

1. Proposals received in response to this RFP will be evaluated as a "best value" procurement.

2. The technical portion of a received proposal will be evaluated.

3. The firm’s price is divided by their total technical score to yield a Dollar Price/Point. The lowest Dollar Price/Point is deemed to be the Best Value firm.

4. It is conceivable that neither the lowest priced firm nor the firm receiving the highest technical points may receive a recommendation for award.

5. Award will be based on total points available, inclusive of possible oral interview/presentation points, and any revised written scoring, resulting from a possible Best and Final Offer (BAFO).

6. The District may utilize a BAFO with those firms susceptible to award.

k. **Award**

The District reserves the right to:

1. Reject any and all proposals.

2. Withdraw, cancel, all, or part, of the RFP, at any time, without prior notice. Reissue a subsequent RFP, as considered necessary by the District.
3. Waive any minor irregularities, technical errors, or information, in the procurement process.

4. Verify all information submitted in a proposal.

5. Approve or disapprove the use of particular subcontractors.

6. Award without negotiation, written or oral discussions, based on the initial written proposal submission.

7. Make award to a proposer, with a responsive proposal, which is the most advantageous to the District, providing the best overall value consistent with the RFP, evaluation criteria, and award methodology.

8. Notify unsuccessful proposers after District approval of such award in a timely manner. Upon submittal, all proposals will be retained by the District.

I. Application of Evaluation Criteria. Technical proposals will be evaluated based on the reviewer’s determination of the degree of compliance with RFP requirements. The evaluation criteria will be applied in the determination of competitive range, final evaluation, and elsewhere as needed in the evaluation steps described in subsequent sections. Based upon individual evaluations, a record of raw evaluation scores will be tabulated through the application of established weights. The “Weighted Method” of scoring will be utilized.

m. Evaluation Scoring. This evaluation process will be used to determine those Proposers in the competitive range. The determination will be based on an overall composite score, arrived at by separate analysis of individual proposals by the evaluation team members.

n. Evaluation Criteria: Technical Proposal. The evaluation criteria in this Section 19. Evaluation Process will be used to evaluate each technical proposal.


1. The Proposals will be evaluated based on each Reviewer’s determination of each criteria and sub-criteria compared to the degree of compliance with Contract requirements. Scores will be assigned according to the following:
2. Evaluators may utilize non-whole numbers, i.e. decimals, in providing their raw scores. The Evaluation Team members will carry out and document its evaluations. Any extreme proposal deficiencies which may render a Proposal unacceptable will be documented. The Team members will make specific note of questions, issues, concerns and areas requiring clarification by Proposer(s) and to be discussed in any meetings with Proposers determined to be within the competitive range.

p. Discussions with Offerors in the Competitive Range.

1. The Proposers determined to be within the competitive range, will be notified and any questions and/or requests for clarifications provided in writing. A negotiating team will be designated by procurement. Each Proposer may be invited for an interview(s) and discussions to discuss answers to written or oral questions, clarifications, and any facet of its proposal.

2. No information, financial or otherwise, will be provided to any Proposer about any of the other Proposals. Proposers will not be given a specific price or specific financial requirements they must meet to gain further consideration. Proposers will not be told of their rankings among the other Proposers.
q. **Best and Final Offers (BAFO)**

1. After all interviews and/or oral presentations have been completed, each of the Proposers in the competitive range may be afforded the opportunity to amend its proposal and submit a BAFO, if the BAFO step of the evaluation process is deemed necessary, and the request shall include:

   a. Notice that discussions/negotiations are concluded.

   b. Notice that this is the opportunity for submission of a BAFO.

   c. A common date and time for submission of written BAFOs, allowing a reasonable opportunity for preparation of the written BAFOs.

   d. Notice that if any modification to a proposal or BAFO is submitted, it must be received by the date and time specified for the receipt of BAFOs and is subject to the late submissions, modifications, and withdrawals of proposals provisions of the RFP.

   e. Notice that if Proposers do not submit a BAFO or a notice of withdrawal and another BAFO, their immediate previous Offer will be construed as their BAFO.

   f. Any modifications to an initial proposal made by a Proposer in its BAFO, shall be identified in the BAFO. The Evaluation Team will evaluate the BAFO using the same criteria used to evaluate the original Proposals, for items that have been re-addressed in the BAFO. BAFO final scores and rankings within each criterion will be tabulated and ranked for consideration according to the relative degrees of importance of the criteria.

2. The proposal which is most advantageous to the District based on the tabulated results will be recommended to the AC TRANSIT Board of Directors (if applicable), otherwise to the General Manager for approval. The results of the evaluations and the selection of a proposal for any award will be documented.
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3. The AC TRANSIT Board of Directors has the option of accepting the recommendation or of making an award to another firm if it feels that such a selection is in the best interests of AC TRANSIT and public transit in the metro Bay area.

Amendments to the Scope of Services

NONE

Amendments to the Cost Proposal Form

NONE

Amendments to the Attachments

NONE

Amendments to the Sample Contract

NONE
Information Provided as the Result of Written Question

1. **Question:** Which column then represents the correct meter for the b/w units?

   **Answer:** The information is presented “As-Is.” Please account for the margin of error present in the available data when estimating future print volumes.

2. **Question:** On Addendum 4 page 2 of 2, under model, several models are listed with fax boards – just confirming you would like fax on these units?

   **Answer:** No fax.

3. **Question:** Can you please explain your “Best and Final” method in your RFP process please?

   **Answer:** See detailed explanation in the revised clause, 19. **Evaluation Process,** spelled out in this addendum.

4. **Question:** Are you and the RFP Panel opposed to a HP printer program where the vendor will service the printers and AC Transit will purchase ink directly from the vendor? Or does AC Transit only want to see a cost per page model? If AC transit, wants to only see a cost per page model, is it expected that ink/toner is included within this cost per page price?

   **Answer:** Prospective vendors should bid the requirement based on the scope of services. In addition, we want all costs included in the cost per page.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 6