



## ADDENDUM NO. 2

**Date:** May 3, 2023

**Bid Due Date:** June 9, 2023, 3:00 P.M. (Local Time)  
~~May 22, 2023, 3:00 P.M. (Local Time)~~

**Bid Name:** Mobility-On-Demand Software App

**Bid Number:** RTSX-240002-DS

---

**NOTE:** This Addendum has been issued to the holders of record of the specifications.

The original Specifications remain in full force and effect except as revised by the following changes which shall take precedence over anything to the contrary:

1. The question submittal deadline has passed; no additional questions will be answered.
2. The Bid Due Date has changed from May 22, 2023 to June 7, 2023, 3:00 p.m. The remaining dates on the anticipated **RFP Time Table** has been updated as follows:

Deadline for uploading of proposals	June 9, 2023 (3:00 p.m. local time)
Evaluation/Selection process	Week of June 19, 2023
Oral presentations, if conducted	Week of June 26, 2023
Projected award date	July/August 2023

3. Question & Answer:

**Question1:** The RFP states that “RTS will continue to provide drivers; vehicles (ADA-accessible 10-12 seater vans or cutaways); and, needed equipment, which includes tablets and computer software, and marketing to operate the service in collaboration with the vendor or app provider. Vendor app shall have capability to interface with relevant RTS operating software(s).”

- a) Can the City please confirm whether the “computer software” mentioned above refers to a driver application? And if not, please clarify what is meant by “computer software.”?
- b) Please provide the details of RTS systems or any 3rd-party systems that need integration with the new solution?

- Answer1:** a) *RTS uses TransLoc's forward-facing PC cloud-based solution for dispatch for rider requests and drivers use the mobile app for iPads or tablets.*  
b) *RTS wants to continue with a Software as a Service (SaaS) app for this project. Proposer will need to advise RTS of any intended integrations.*
- Question2: Can the City provide the service hours, days, and number of vehicles needed for this microtransit service?
- Answer2:** *Service is provided 5:30-8:00 AM and 3:30-6:00 PM, Monday through Friday, using 2-3 vehicles.*
- Question3: Can the City please provide more details regarding the fixed-route service, including the number of routes, trips per day, total trips, and service hours?
- Answer3:** *Fixed route service is not included in this RFP. The new software will only be used for Microtransit.*
- Question4: Who is the incumbent provider?
- Answer4:** *TransLoc, Inc.*
- Question5: In the Future capabilities section of the RFP, it says: "Have an open API that is capable of integrating with trip planning and mobile ticketing apps (e.g. Kontron)"  
a) Will the City provide the API for the integration or are the vendors expected to provide the API?
- Answer5:** *The section regarding "...future capabilities..." under 2.4.5 Data Collecting and Reporting Requirements is hereby deleted in its' entirety.*
- Question6: In the Future capabilities section, it asks whether the vendor has the ability to consume the GTFS to provide additional information to the public.  
a) Can the City clarify whether it expects the new software to operate the fixed route service or just the microtransit?
- Answer6:** *The section regarding "...future capabilities..." under 2.4.5 Data Collecting and Reporting Requirements is hereby deleted in its' entirety.*
- Question7: Can the City confirm whether the vendor should submit one unredacted confidential copy with the trade secrets highlighted and one redacted copy if there is confidential content in the proposal?
- Answer7:** *Yes, proposer would submit two versions, refer to "How to Designate Trade Secret or Otherwise Confidential and Exempt Information", page 13, numbers 1 and 2.*
- Question8: Could the City extend the response submission deadline to allow bidders to submit more responsive and informative proposals?
- Answer8:** *The City is willing to extend the current due date from May 22, 2023 to June 7, 2023, P.M.*
- Question9: Section 2.4.1 requires the generation of configurable promotional codes. Can you please provide more detail and/or a specific use case to clarify the requirement?
- Answer9:** *Can the vendor generate information (code) that the agency could use to promote its services? It is related the previous statement about "configurable Agency settings".*
- Question10: It is stated there will be 2-3 vehicles per zone; will vehicles travel between zones?
- Answer10:** *Currently yes. Would like option to restrict to single zone or multiple zones.*

- Question11: In section 2.4.2 there is a requirement for the ability to set a method to deny trips when demand outnumbers available resources. Generally, if there is no availability, we will show an alternative time or simply indicate there is no availability. Will this suffice? If not, can you please provide more detail and/or a specific use case to clarify the requirement?
- Answer11:** *Yes, this would suffice.*
- Question12: Section 2.4.3 requires passengers to book recurring rides from the mobile app. It is advisable that RTS maintain control over recurring rides by setting a policy and monitoring compliance with the recurring ride policy; it is recommended that recurring rides be created using the back-office dispatcher-facing portal and that passengers simply request recurring rides through the mobile app or passenger-facing trip management portal. Is this acceptable to RTS?
- Answer12:** *The intent is to have passengers use the app versus calling in to book both single rides or recurring rides.*
- Question13: Section 2.4.4 requires a driver-facing web-based portal that interfaces with all web browsers and has the following functionalities. Is a native mobile solution an acceptable alternative to a browser-based solution?
- Answer13:** *Yes.*
- Question14: Section 2.4.5 requires reports broken down by postal code; there is another requirement to provided reports by OD zone. Please provide logic in the event a postal zone crosses multiple OD zones.
- Answer14:** *The vendor provides O-D data for all affected trips. RTS does not have the capacity to modify existing postal zones.*
- Question15: Section 2.4.5 requires all statistics be available on an individual trip basis in an agency-facing dashboard with maps and Graphical User Interface (GUI). At a minimum, the dashboard should include views for: all booked trips, including origin/destination mapping capabilities, all driver shifts, all KPI statistics, vehicle & driver management, and shift management. Please provide clarification on what is meant by “all statistics be available on an individual trip basis”; does this mean RTS is simply looking for a daily, real-time list of trips? Also, please clarify what is meant by mapping capabilities and vehicle & driver management for this statistical/dashboard output.
- Answer15:** *The statistics identified are basic data used for transit planning. Data on daily trips will assist in that planning process.*
- Question16: In section 2.4.9, there is a requirement to import existing data for continuity of operations reasons including client, operator and schedule information/GTFS feed. Can RTS please provide a format for client and operator information? Also, please confirm that static and real-time GTFS information will be provided on a regular basis by RTS.
- Answer16:** *Yes.*
- Question17: The vendor security questionnaire requires copies of various documents. Can we declare compliance and provide copies of documents when awarded?
- Answer17:** *No, the documentation needs to be reviewed before an award recommendation can occur.*
- Question18: In 2.4.7, RTS refers to a TLC certificate. Can you expand on that and its role in the solution? (requirement language, “All public facing web servers have been hardened using industry best practices, including updating servers according to latest security bulletins. External tools are used to verify the integrity of the TLC certificates and how they are applied to the servers.”)

**Answer18:** *It should state TLS certificate.*

Question19: What are the current operating hours for the mobility on demand (MOD) service?

**Answer19:** *Refer to Answer2.*

Question20: How many vehicles does the City use for the current MOD service?

**Answer20:** *Refer to Answer2.*

Question21: Will the City allow respondents to submit additional/supplemental pricing materials in addition to filling out the provided price proposal form?

**Answer21:** *It is preferred that no additional/supplemental pricing materials be submitted, as they will not be considered.*

Question22: Regarding 2.4.2 Back Office Dispatcher-Facing Dashboard (browser-based) “Add out-of-zone addresses riders can choose from.”

- Can the City provide an example list of out-of-zone addresses?

**Answer22:** *123 SW Main Street, Gainesville, FL.*

Question23: Regarding 2.4.3 Passenger-Facing Features of the App “Ability for users to book multiple trips (outside of a defined time window and within the allowable O-D trip distance), recurring rides, and pre-schedule rides up to a customizable number of days in advance.”

- Can the City clarify whether the intention is for users to be able to book trips outside of a defined time window or inside a defined time window?

**Answer23:** *Book a ride within a defined time window.*

Question24: Regarding 2.4.3 Passenger-Facing Features of the App “Ability to request MOD vehicle and seat type.”

- Can the City provide more information on what MOD vehicle and seat types are available in the current service, and what vehicle and seat types the City intends for users to have the ability to request in the future?

**Answer24:** *Regular seat and wheelchair.*

Question25: Regarding 2.4.4 Driver-facing features of the App “Ability for driver to pause app without redirecting rides to another vehicle.”

- Can the City clarify in what scenarios the driver would need to pause the app?

**Answer25:** *To use a restroom or when on a break.*

Question26: Regarding 1. Support in the Prerequisite Vendor Questionnaire: “Is there a knowledge base available after GoLive?”

- Can the City clarify what knowledge base this question is referring to?

**Answer26:** *Ability for vendor to provide assistance after the system (app) is launched.*

Question27: Can the City provide a KML or Shapefile of the zone boundaries as scoped?

**Answer27:** *Yes.*

Question28: Can the City provide ridership and quality of service (e.g., average wait time, average trip duration, etc.) information for the current MOD service?

**Answer28:** *Wait time 15 minutes, 20 minutes of trip time.*

Question29: Can the City confirm which software partner they currently use for the MOD service?

**Answer29:** *Refer to Answer4.*

- Question30: Would Gainesville consider an extension to the proposal submission due date to accommodate the complexity of this RFP?  
**Answer30:** *Refer to Answer8.*
- Question31: Will Gainesville accept electronic signatures on the forms and cover letter?  
**Answer31:** *Yes.*
- Question32: The RFP expresses a desire to integrate with multi-modal trip planning and/or mobile ticketing solutions. Does Gainesville currently use a trip planning and/or mobile ticketing solution?  
**Answer32:** *Refer to Answer5.*
- Question33: Is integration with trip planning and/or mobile ticketing part of the desired scope of work OR would this be a future phase?  
**Answer33:** *Refer to Answer5.*
- Question34: What does Gainesville anticipate in terms of an implementation timeline - i.e. when will the first zone be launched and when should subsequent zones be anticipated to launch?  
**Answer34:** *RTS is already operating a MOD service.*
- Question35: Does Gainesville have a target Productivity (Passengers per Vehicle Hour) for this program/service?  
**Answer35:** *No.*
- Question36: Is there a DBE Requirement or goal for this project?  
**Answer36:** *As stated on top of page 24 of the RFP, there is no specific goal for this project.*
- Question37: Most of the IT requirements are meant for on-premise solutions and we would not be able to respond appropriately to questions pertaining to VMs, Operating system, databases etc. since they are not relevant in a SAAS environment. Does that disqualify us from bidding or will lead to a low score?  
**Answer37:** *The City wants a SaaS solution for this app, so you would have to meet only those IT requirements that would be applicable.*
- Question38: 2.3 Objective has the sentence “For equity, the technology will also allow customers to book a ride by using a phone line.” Does this mean that customers would call into the City’s call center?  
**Answer38:** *Yes.*
- Question39: 2.3 Objective has the sentence “Vendor app shall have capability to interface with relevant RTS operating software(s).” What are the other operating softwares?  
**Answer39:** *APC and Clever Devices.*
- Question40: 2.4.1 Back Office Administrator Dashboard (browser-based) states “Ability to add a minimum of 7 service geographic areas using 2-3 vehicles each.” What is the breakdown of max active concurrent (Year 1-5) vehicles per year?  
**Answer40:** *This is budget-dependent.*
- Question41: 2.4.3 Passenger-Facing Features of the App states “Depict real-time vehicle locator map, including fixed route operations.” To clarify, is real-time vehicle tracking mandatory?

**Answer41:** *Yes.*

Question42: 2.4.3 Passenger-Facing Features of the App states “System assigns passenger bookings (including pre-scheduled rides) to a driver manifest immediately upon booking.” How far in advance are pre-scheduled rides? What is the nature or purpose of the pre-scheduled rides? Would this mean a commingled service, for example microtransit and paratransit?

**Answer42:** *30 minutes, minimum.*

Question43: Under the “The following constitute future capabilities” heading, do we need to address these items in our proposal? If the City expects a response, could the City provide additional context for each bullet as to what kind of information you are looking for?

**Answer43:** *Refer to Answer5.*

Question44: Under the “The following constitute future capabilities” heading is the bullet “System should have an open API that is capable of integrating with trip planning and mobile ticketing apps (e.g. Kontron) that allows customers to plan a trip and pay for a trip on the service without using the provider’s app. Native integration is preferred.” For what purpose does the City use Kontron? Is a native integration strongly preferred? Could the City please provide contact information for Kontron so that we may reach out to them and appropriately price this item in our proposal response?

**Answer44:** *Refer to Answer5.*

Question45: Is the following “Proposer must have 3 years or more of experience in developing and administering MOD Apps” the only Minimum Qualification to address as referenced in 4.2 Content of Proposal, b. Address each Minimum Qualification?

**Answer45:** *Yes.*

Question46: 4.2 Content of Proposal states that the Drug-Free Workplace Form, Bidder Verification Form, and References Form are the Required Documents. Are the following also required as well and to be included in our proposal submission?

- Certification Regarding Debarment
- Certification Regarding Lobbying
- Disclosure Of Lobbying Activities
- Subcontractor/Subconsultant List And Bidder Status
- Contractor Responsibility Certification
- Federally Funded Purchase Questionnaire

**Answer46:** *Yes, bottom of each form states it must be completed and returned.*

Question47: For the Prerequisite Vendor Questionnaire, how should bidders submit our answers? Within the proposal itself in a separate section or give our answers on pages that are appended after the questionnaire?

**Answer47:** *Bidder’s choice.*

4. Find attached:

- Prohibition of Lobbying in Procurement Matters

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Each Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 2 by his or her signature below, **and shall attach a copy of this Addendum to its proposal.**

CERTIFICATION BY PROPOSER

The undersigned acknowledges receipt of this Addendum No. 2 and the Proposal submitted is in accordance with information, instructions, and stipulations set forth herein.

PROPOSER: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

# CITY OF \_\_\_\_\_ FINANCIAL SERVICES GAINESVILLE PROCEDURES MANUAL

## 41-524 **Prohibition of Lobbying in Procurement Matters**

Except as expressly set forth in Resolution 170116, Section 9, during the Cone of Silence as defined herein no person may lobby, on behalf of a competing party in a particular procurement process, City Officials or employees, except the Procurement Division or the procurement designated staff contact person. Violation of this provision shall result in disqualification of the party on whose behalf the lobbying occurred.

Cone of Silence period means the period between the issue date which allows for immediate submittals to the City of Gainesville Procurement Division in response to an invitation to bid, or a request for proposal, or qualifications, or information, or an invitation to negotiate, as applicable, and the time that City Officials or the Procurement Division, or City Department awards the contract.

Lobbying means when a person seeks to influence or attempt to influence City Officials or employees with respect to a decision of the City, except as authorized by procurement procedures.