



MAY 29TH, 2025

TO: FCRTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: MOSES STITES, GENERAL MANAGER, FCRTA
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR INTRA-CITY DEMAND RESPONSE SERVICE AND INTER-CITY FIXED ROUTE SERVICE

STAFF REPORT

BACKGROUND: FCRTA released a Request for Proposals (RFP) on January 23rd, 2025. The contracted services that went out to bid included Inter-City Fixed Routes, and Intra-City Demand Response Services. Bidder's proposals were due on February 25th, 2025, at three (3) pm. We received two (2) proposals from national companies and one (1) from a non-profit agency for these services. Interviews with all were held on April 10th, 2025.

The first proposal was from Fresno Economic Opportunities Commission (FEOC). FEOC is a local private non-profit agency that previously operated FCRTA services for 35 years as well as other social service contracts. The second proposal was from WeDriveU Inc. WeDriveU, formerly known as National Express Transit, operates across the U.S. as part the global mobility corporation, Mobico Group. WeDriveU has 37 years of experience in transit operations and their U.S. corporate headquarters are in Burlingame, California. The third proposal was received by the current subcontractor MV Transportation Inc., one of the largest privately held public transportation firms in the United States, with corporate headquarters located in Dallas, Texas. Founded in 1975, MV Transportation operates hundreds of dial-a-ride, transit, and ferry operations throughout North America.

OFFER SCORING RESULTS AND RANKING:

Fresno County Rural Transit Agency (FCRTA) established a three-member Scoring Panel that reviewed submitted proposals by Fresno Economic Opportunities Commission, MV Transportation, and WeDriveU. The scoring panel consisted of one FCRTA staff person, one Kings Area Rural Transit staff person, and one Clovis Transit staff person.

Scores for each proposal were determined by the review of each proposal by the Scoring Panel and by in-person interviews conducted with all three proposers by the Scoring Panel and by cost. Scores were based on the following criteria:

- Operations experience and history with similar transit contracts. Understanding RFP requirements and the scope of services described in the RFP (30%)
- Public transit management capabilities. Qualified, experienced management staff. Commitment to safety, quality, and efficiency. Demonstrated understanding and commitment to equitable labor management practices (40%)
- Financial stability of Proposer. Reasonableness of price proposal (30%)
- 10% of the total score of the above 3 categories shall be added as a bonus to proposals meeting California Labor Code Sections 1070-1074 (10%)

The Scoring Panel found the following notable aspects for each proposal:

- MV Transportation-Lowest cost of 3. Very Good proposal and interview. As the current contractor, their experience showed. The current Operations Manager was outstanding during the interview and is a candidate to be a future GM
- WeDriveU- 2nd lowest cost of 3. Good proposal and interview. The proposed Operations Manager was preferred over the proposed GM. Cost substantially higher than the low bidder.
- Fresno Economic Opportunities Commission -Highest cost of 3. Substandard proposal and interview. Very high cost. The proposal was largely unprofessional, lacked details and the proposed insurance terms were a major concern.

Average of the 3 scores for each proposal and ranking of each proposal by panel:

- MV Transportation-95.6 **1st Place**
- WeDriveU-81.6 **2nd Place**
- Fresno Economic Opportunities Commission-48.6 **3rd Place**

	FEOC	WeDriveU	MV
Panelist #1	35	70	93
Panelist #2	45	80	95
Panelist #3	66	95	99
Average	48.6	81.6	95.6
Rank	3	2	1

The three panelists made use of a scoring sheet, a review aid to help identify desirable elements of a proposal, and written notes during the scoring process. The scoring sheets, review aid, and written notes are attached separately.

PROPOSAL NEGOTIATIONS:

The Scoring Panel determined that an average score of 90 or higher would be the "competitive range" for the RFP. Only MV Transportation's proposal achieved this average score. The Scoring Panel determined that only MV Transportation would be recommended to proceed into negotiations. All 3 proposals promised to hire the existing staff, so no scoring adjustments were made.

The Proposal Negotiations process was conducted solely with MV Transportation following the Interviews. The Proposal Negotiation process clarified elements of the MV Proposal, including a new final price, which will be the basis for the proposed third-party contract. The table below outlines the final costs submitted by each firm. These cost totals include startup costs in the first year excluding insurance costs. . MV Transportation did offer FCRTA costs with insurance at a substantial savings as well as no startup costs being necessary as they are the incumbent contractor. This contract price was determined to be fair and reasonable.

	FEOC	MV Transportation	WeDriveU
YEAR 1	\$7,002,480	\$3,928,975	\$4,523,868
YEAR 2	\$7,314,090	\$4,020,007	\$4,735,051
YEAR 3	\$7,639,567	\$4,213,159	\$4,935,930
YEAR 4	\$7,979,528	\$4,415,064	\$5,145,557
YEAR 5	\$8,334,617	\$4,580,789	\$5,404,875
YEAR 6	\$8,705,508	\$4,747,098	\$5,586,395
YEAR 7	\$9,092,903	\$4,928,579	\$5,830,372
TOTALS	\$56,068,693	\$30,883,671	\$36,162,048

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Based on the highest evaluation score among the three responsive proposers and lowest overall cost, staff recommends award of FCRTA inter-city services and intra-city services to MV Transportation for the period and cost specified above. This recommendation is consistent with Board-adopted contracting principles and a pre-award letter of approval from Caltrans. The contract will also contain an option to extend the period of operations beyond the initial three (3) years, upon Board approval, in one-year increments for up to four additional years.

Staff recommends the award of a three (3) year contract for the operation of FCRTA's intra-city and inter-city services to MV transportation, with a total amount not to exceed \$12,162,141: \$3,928,975 for FY 2025-26; \$4,020,007 for FY 2026-27; and \$4,213,159 for FY 2027-28.