RFP No. 2018-033
Parking Count and Guidance System
Final Evaluation Scoring Summary Form

Buyer Name: Ryan Lingholm
Technical Evaluations: 8/9/2018
Presentations: 8/30/2018
Final Evaluations: 8/30/2018

Experience, Background, & References 40 Pts Max.	Hal King	Clayton Gilbert	Jorge Alarcon	Criterion Score	Experience, Background, & References 40 Pts Max. Scoring Discussions
All Traffic Solutions	15.0	33.0	28.0	76.0	Past contracts smaller in size, number of years in business wasn't clear, no experience listed, one reference non-responsive and one was not system that was proposed, no past local experience, proposal vague
Frogparking	35.0	35.0	37.0	107.0	Founded in New Zealand, presence in California, eight years in business, excellent reference feedback (New Zealand airport), technical background in other projects, multimillion dollar projects
Keytop USA	25.0	33.0	30.0	88.0	Over a million parking sensors installed, founded (branch) in 2006, local technician in West Palm Beach (WPB), projects in Asia (some in USA), no description of team or their experience, excellent reference but came from vendor rather than project owner, midrange dollar value contracts
Park Assist	40.0	35.0	40.0	115.0	In business for 13 years, regional office in Ft Lauderdale, South Florida references (Ft Lauderdale airport, Brickell, etc.), personnel has several years of experience, references were both good and excellent, high-dollar contracts
ParkEyes Group	25.0	33.0	30.0	88.0	Dolphin mall presence but no USA reference, international company, four years in business but no description of team, silver award but also noted two month delay
ParkHelp	15.0	35.0	20.0	70.0	Significant number of references but no good reference feedback, only excellent reference came from vendor (not owner of project), 15 years experience, proposed team had limited description, Florida office mentioned but couldn't find where in Florida
Parking Guidance Systems	30.0	35.0	40.0	105.0	Strong corporate structure, Ft Lauderdale (American Heritage) solution implemented (Tampa airport and Winter Park hospital too), office in Clearwater, excellent reference feedback from local installs, limited details of proposed team, six years in business but located in Austria, Disney reference
Parking Sense USA	32.0	34.0	32.0	98.0	Four year old company, no local accounts listed, project team description included resumes, some excellent reference feedback, large contracts (approaching $4M)

Proposed System & Understanding of Scope 40 Pts Max.	Hal King	Clayton Gilbert	Jorge Alarcon	Criterion Score	Proposed System & Understanding of Scope 40 Pts Max. Scoring Discussions
All Traffic Solutions	15.0	33.0	28.0	76.0	Combination of ultrasonic and cameras, handicap indication signs, back office reporting and standard warranty not clear, several equipment components listed but hard to tell if it's part of proposed system, lacked implementation detail
Frogparking	35.0	35.0	38.0	108.0	Broke down each floor of garage, details of signage locations, implementation plan detailed, 100% accuracy with laser system, blueprints of garage with proposal, mobile app, need clarity of warranty, wireless system and surface mount system
Keytop USA	30.0	33.0	30.0	93.0	Using camera system, proposed signs weren't clear, cloud-based reporting, find my car option, offered app with real-time capabilities, included two year warranty, generic implementation plan, some equipment proposed in solution weren't included in fee proposal
Park Assist	38.0	35.0	36.0	109.0	Cloud-based reporting with offline function, not sure if mobile app is extra, one year warranty included, low service level, camera-based (M-4) hardware, have license-plate-recognition (LPR) capabilities, counters into concrete may pose issues, comprehensive training program, most cameras systems in North America
ParkEyes Group	15.0	30.0	32.0	77.0	Camera system proposed only 2 megapixel, proposal started after 150 pages of technical information, mobile application programming interface (API) but no mobile equipment in fee proposal, no training program proposed, system has video surveillance, pre-booking reservation system, cloud-based solution for software not proposed
ParkHelp	25.0	35.0	36.0	96.0	Comparable solution to City's goal, reviewed and incorporated City's garage designs, camera-based hardware with LPR capabilities, units operate without server connection, no mobile app, no training plan, no breakdown of equipment proposed, 5 megapixel camera solution, LPR for roof top
Parking Guidance Systems	30.0	34.0	30.0	94.0	Not cloud-based software, listed several items not included with proposal, not clear if roof top sensors were included in $200,000 proposal, included one year warranty on some equipment and five year warranty on other equipment, electrical component not included, low recurring costs, no mobile app or training plan, ultrasonic solution with 5 megapixel camera reference, need 100 spaces per day during implementation, need climate control location for server, matrix sign not included in proposed solution, message boards most flexible with most options
Parking Sense USA	30.0	33.0	30.0	93.0	Proposing ultra-sonic sensors, mobile app looks to be included but not certain, training included but no training plan, implementation plan generic, only 95% accuracy, no video/camera system, custom design monuments and EV charging

Fee Proposal 10 Pts Max.	Hal King	Clayton Gilbert	Jorge Alarcon	Criterion Score	Fee Proposal 10 Pts Max. Scoring Discussions
All Traffic Solutions	10.0	6.0	5.0	21.0	Stated proposal was only an estimate, lowest proposed solution
Frogparking	4.0	7.0	6.0	17.0	Highest proposal, proposed tax in part of proposal, battery replacement will be extra, several possibilities that system can handle
Keytop USA	7.0	7.0	8.0	22.0	Fee proposal and proposed solution didn't match
Park Assist	3.0	8.0	9.0	20.0	Not sure if mobile app is included, one year warranty included, relatively high-priced system with high recurring costs (around $53,000)
ParkEyes Group	5.0	8.0	6.0	19.0	Unclear of all costs associated with system, no breakdown of equipment, mid-range of other solutions proposed
ParkHelp	6.0	8.0	7.0	21.0	Mid-range priced in comparison to others, recurring costs were relatively low for annual plan
Parking Guidance Systems	8.0	8.0	6.0	22.0	Camera-based system increases proposal by $35,000, lower price in comparison to other proposals, no recurring costs, not complete turnkey (didn't include electrical), unclear on pricing extras ($39,000 extra for parking sensors on roof)
Parking Sense USA	9.0	7.0	7.0	23.0	Relatively low costs and recurring costs, design costs not included, question regarding whether installation included in cost, no support on weekends, proposal more than what's calculated if you include recurring costs

Interviews 10 Pts Max.	Hal King	Clayton Gilbert	Jorge Alarcon	Criterion Score	Interviews 10 Pts Max. Scoring Discussions
All Traffic Solutions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not shortlisted by Evaluation Committee
Frogparking	5.0	9.0	8.0	22.0	Gave impression of not being as prepared as others; spent time with sign layout, sensor placement, etc.; clarified app and ability to integrate with citation platform; lacking southeast US presence; clear and descriptive answers to questions; clarified sensors are flush mounted
Keytop USA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not shortlisted by Evaluation Committee
Park Assist	8.0	9.0	5.0	22.0	A lot of time spent on add-ons rather than what was included in proposal solution, didn't bring sample product/equipment, answered all questions clearly, local presence, well prepared
ParkEyes Group	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not shortlisted by Evaluation Committee
ParkHelp	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not shortlisted by Evaluation Committee
Parking Guidance Systems	7.0	9.0	10.0	26.0	Energetic, covered all areas requested for clarification, non-clarity of proposal (included, not included, etc.) outweighed great presentation
Parking Sense USA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not shortlisted by Evaluation Committee

Ranking	Score
All Traffic Solutions	173.0
Frogparking	254.0
Keytop USA	203.0
Park Assist	266.0
ParkEyes Group	184.0
ParkHelp	187.0
Parking Guidance Systems	247.0
Parking Sense USA	214.0