

ADDENDUM ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM

RFP-007-25-25
ADDENDUM #2

Project No: RFP-007-25-25
Project Title: METS Mobile Ticketing Services
Opening Date: Thursday, August 21, 2025 @ 1:30 p.m.
Addendum Number: (2) **Date:** August 15, 2025

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ARE APPLICABLE TO THE ORIGINAL SPECIFICATIONS OF THE ABOVE-REFERENCED RFP:

This addendum includes the following:

A. *Cellular Connectivity*

1. Which cellular carrier(s) does METS currently use for onboard data services?

ANSWER: ATT and T Mobile

2. Does METS require the mobile ticketing solution to support multiple cellular carriers?

ANSWER: Yes

3. What data plan is being included with the provided SIM cards?

ANSWER: Either ATT, Verizon, T Mobile

4. Would METS consider, as an option, using SIM cards and associated data services provided directly by the mobile ticketing system (MTS) vendor?

ANSWER: Yes

B. *Farebox Integration – Genfare Odyssey*

1. For the required integration with the existing Genfare Odyssey fareboxes, what specific data elements and parameters will Genfare be expected to share with the MTS back-office system?

ANSWER: We are not sure it is dependent upon Proposal.

2. Please provide the physical and electrical interface specifications for connecting the MTS hardware to the Genfare Odyssey farebox.

ANSWER: The fareboxes are on the 12v system in the front of the bus.

3. Confirm that any cost related to licensing and services that Genfare requires to be connected with the MTS will be covered directly by METS.

ANSWER: We are not sure it is dependent upon Proposal.

C. Payment Processing

1. Will METS designate a specific payment processor for the mobile ticketing system?

ANSWER: No

2. Is METS open to the use of an alternative payment processor proposed by the MTS vendor?

ANSWER: Yes

D. Customer Service Expectations

1. The RFP does not explicitly define the extent of rider-facing support. Is the MTS vendor expected to provide full direct customer service to riders, if so via which means, or will METS qualify and filter rider inquiries through its own customer service team before escalation?

ANSWER: A proposal that includes a comprehensive direct customer support plan, detailing how support will be provided to riders, is preferred and will receive a higher score under "Proposal Content" compared to one that does not.

E. Validation Configuration

1. Does METS intend to implement single-door validation only, or should the system be designed to support multi-door validation capabilities?

ANSWER: Single-door validation

F. Forms Requiring Notarization

1. Several required forms must be notarized. Will METS accept notarization performed by a Canadian notary public for these forms?

ANSWER: Yes, this is acceptable

G. Bid Security Submission

1. Due to the short time frame for proposal preparation, is it acceptable for the bid security to be sent in a separate package from the proposal if it is being issued from a different location than where the proposal is being printed?

ANSWER: Since this project is being let through a RFP process opposed to an IFB, if a vendor does not include a security bond enclosed in their sealed package, the City will not reject a vendor's proposal solely for the absence of the security bond, however the vendor's score will be affected.

THIS ADDENDUM NOW BECOMES A PART OF THE ORIGINAL RFP.

THIS *ADDENDUM ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM* SHALL BE SIGNED, DATED, AND RETURNED WITH THE RESPONSE BY AN AUTHORIZED COMPANY REPRESENTATIVE.

COMPANY: _____

BY: _____

TITLE: _____

DATE: _____

PHONE NUMBER: _____

SIGNATURE: _____