

MILWAUKEE TRANSPORT SERVICES, INC.

Friday, August 7, 2020

ADDENDUM NO: 4
RFP NO: MM-06-20 CAD/AVL ONBOARD COMMUNICATION
OPENING DATE: AUGUST 21, 2020 @ 2:00 PM, CST

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Section 6.6.3.20 and sub-bullets are related to a maintenance system. To generate these reports a maintenance management information system (MMIS) is required that tracks all maintenance activity, includes inventory management, maintenance work management, maintenance workflow, vendor management, and much more.

1a. Does MCTS currently have a MMIS system?

Answer: No, at this time our MCTS-Portal is not integrated with real-time data from the bus.

1.b If so, can you please provide the product name, vendor and contact information?

Answer: N/A

1.c If not, does MCTS desire the vendor to provide a MMIS system solution?

Answer: No

1.d If not, can MCTS please remove these requirements?

Answer: This will be removed

2. Section 7.7 and all sub-bullets appear to be describing an onboard battery management system, as well as the fixed-end battery charging station.

2a. Can MCTS clarify that this section is for onboard integration?

Answer: The CAD system should support B.E.B onboard real-time data related to charge levels of the propulsion battery.

2b. If not, can MCTS clarify the needs of the battery management system relative to onboard and fixed-end system interfaces?

Answer: N/A

3. Regarding section 7.7.1.a, can MCTS clarify the use of time synchronization, by the battery management system?

Answer: The system shall experience no time delay and report pertinent onboard battery management data as received and in real-time.

4. Regarding section 7.7.1.c, can MCTS please clarify what is meant by "block data" and how it is used by the battery charged monitoring system?

Answer: Block number or (aka) Run number. The CAD system would need to share the route and run number or log-on data to the battery monitoring system.

5. Section 6.4.6.3 requires unlimited length, while 5.4.9.7 limits the text messages to 254 ASCII characters. Will MCTS consider revising this to limit the data message to 254 characters?

Answer: both say: (6.4.6.3) shall automatically paginate messages exceeding the display limit (5.4.9.7) shall paginate longer messages at appropriate word and sentence boundaries. So, it is 254 characters per page and unlimited pages.

6. Regarding section 6.6.2.1.a, can MCTS please provide the make, model and contact information for the voice recording system?

Answer: 6.6.2.1 will remain as a requirement 6.6.2.1a will be removed as a sub bullet

6a. Can MCTS please provide the ICD associated with the voice recording system, to access historical data for purposes of playback?

Answer: N/A.

6b. If not, will MCTS please consider removing this requirement?

Answer: N/A

7. Regarding section 6.6.2.1.b, can MCTS please clarify the purpose of GTFS-RT data during playback?

Answer: 6.6.2.1 will remain as a requirement 6.6.2.1b will be removed as a sub bullet

7a. If not, will MCTS please consider removing this requirement?

Answer: N/A

7b. Is this to generate GTFS-RT data during playback?

Answer: N/A

8. Section 6.6.2.1.c is about AVA. Playback is typically used to revisit what the dispatcher sees and what actions they take. Can MCTS please clarify what is required for AVA during playback?

Answer: 6.6.2.1 will remain as a requirement 6.6.2.1c will be removed as a sub bullet

8a. If not, will MCTS please consider removing this requirement?

Answer: N/A

9. Regarding section 6.6.2.1.d. video recordings are only available if they are retrieved from the bus, which is through request, emergency alarm, or another rare event. Typically, the video will not be available.

9a. Will MCTS please define how much video is currently retrieved from the fleet and how often?

Answer: 6.6.2.1 will remain as a requirement 6.6.2.1d will be removed as a sub bullet

9b. Will MCTS consider removing this requirement?

Answer: N/A

10. Regarding section 6.6.2.2, if Sections 6.6.2.1a-d are removed, will MCTS please consider removing requirement 6.6.2.2?

Answer: This item will be removed

11. Regarding section 6.2.10. Can MCTS please provide the API for roadway conditions and real-time traffic feed?

Answer: The choice of provider of the data is up to the vendor. Once you select a vendor you will need to work with their API. This is not currently part of our system. If a licensed service is selected the cost must be part of the maintenance pricing.

11a. Will MCTS accept Google Maps for real-time traffic to address this requirement?

Answer: Yes, this is acceptable but If a licensed service is selected the cost must be part of the maintenance pricing

12. Regarding section 6.3.2.1.b, can MCTS please provide the API for the HR system to feed operator work back to the HR system?

Answer: No API exists, we would like most complete set of data vendor can offer. SOAP or REST will most likely be used to move data into HR system by MCTS once extracts are made.

13. Section 5.4.12.10 requires the MDT to know the status of the bus in front of them. Only the central system knows the status of all buses. Can MCTS please clarify the purpose of this requirement?

Answer: It is the intent that the system will notify the driver via the MDT so they can adjust to the situation if necessary. CM rather than F can be used to provide alternative fully automated option for notifying the driver.

13a. Will MCTS consider removing this requirement?

Answer: No

14. Section 4.1.5 is the responsibility of the WR-54, which has been specified by MCTS.

14a. Does MCTS require dual cellular data plans (one for each SIM)?

Answer: Yes, but SIMS and data plans will be purchased / provided by MCTS. Pricing should not include data plans.

14b. The WR-54 only supports failover to the backup service provider through the second SIM. Therefore, will MCTS please consider changing 4.1.5 to the following "When multiple cellular data network paths are available (now or in future, i.e. connections through two separate SIM cards), the system shall automatically **failover to the backup service provider through the second SIM** ~~determine the best path by policy.~~?"

Answer: All work to this effort has been completed by MCTS. This requirement will be removed

14c. If not, will MCTS please consider removing this requirement?

Answer: This requirement will be removed

15. Section 4.1.6 and all sub-bullets are the responsibility of the WR-54, which has been specified by MCTS. The WR-54 does not support selecting the best path. It can only communicate on one service provider (SIM) at a time. The WR-54 does support failover. Will MCTS please consider removing 4.1.6 and all sub-bullets?

Answer: All work to this effort has been completed by MCTS. This requirement will be removed

16. Section 4.5.1.3 is the responsibility of the WR-54 which has been specified by MCTS. The WR-54 does not support selecting the best path. It can only communicate on one service provider (SIM) at a time. The WR-54 does support failover. Will MCTS please consider removing 4.5.1.3 and all sub-bullets?

Answer: All work to this effort has been completed by MCTS. This requirement will be removed

17. Regarding section 6.5.1.6 and sub-bullets, Trip Planning for schedule purposes is part of the scheduling system. Can MCTS please clarify what is involved with "resolve any abnormal situations" for each of the sub-bullets?

Answer: The sub bullets were provided as examples of abnormalities. If what is exported from planning and arrives in CAD are different, 1 of the systems has an issue. Cooperation from both parties is expected in finding a resolution.

17a. If not, will MCTS consider removing this requirement?

Answer: N/A

18. Regarding section 6.5.1.6 and sub-bullets, Trip Planning for schedule purposes is part of the scheduling system. Since trip planning is part of the scheduling system, if this requirement remains, please clarify that MCTS would coordinate with the scheduling system contractor.

Answer: Yes, the intent is that the CAD AVL vendor would be part of the process and only responsible for issues on their side of the equation. Assisting in resolution where possible on the other side of the equation. MCTS would coordinate between the two vendors

18a. If not, can MCTS provide guidance as to how the contractor would know that there is an issue with any of the sub-bullets that result in an abnormal situation?

Answer: N/A

19. Sections 6.5.5.14 and 6.4.5.15 are features of the voice console and its associated devices (headsets, handsets, PTT, audio interfaces, etc.), as well as integration to the telephone system.

19a. Can MCTS please provide the design documents of the existing voice console solution including the voice console model, the list of ancillary equipment (headsets, handsets, audio interface equipment, PTT, footswitch, others, as well as all audio interfaces that it currently integrates with and any ancillary equipment that exists to support this integration?

Answer: No

19b. If not, will you consider removing these two requirements as they are typical of the voice console and radio system?

Answer: No

19c. If the requirements cannot be removed, can you provide clarification as to the intent of these two items?

Answer: The intent is that if the optional VOIP is installed the same equipment will be used and based on the selected direction radio or VOIP the hardware will transmit over 1 active system and not both systems.

20. Sections 6.2.4 and 6.2.5 refer to GIS editing software. Does MCTS currently have GIS editing software such as ArcGIS or other?

Answer: Yes, we use ArcGIS

20a. If yes, do you really want the vendor to quote another GIS editor?

Answer: Only if ArcGIS will not work with the base maps the vendor is supplying.

20b. If not, would MCTS consider removing these requirements?

Answer: We will not remove it but language shall be changed added to 6.2.4 and 6.2.5 to read ArcGIS will be supplied by MCTS if this software will not work to meet requirements with vendors maps the vendor must supply GIS editing software.

21. Can MCTS please confirm that section 7.1.4 is relative to the fixed-end IT system solution?

Answer: This is for any system that is patched or updated

21a. If not, can MCTS please clarify?

Answer: A patch or update should not affect the entire fleet before it is tested. In the case of updates on the buses, that may consist of taking a single off-line bus or a mini fleet to apply before the entire fleet is rolled out. All system updates / patches must be tested before applied to the enterprise.

22. Regarding section 7.1.4, can you provide clarification as to what is meant by “patches and updates to external system integrations”?

Answer: If you built an interface and patch or update it you are responsible for testing and implementation success of that interface, not the other systems patches and updates.

22a. Is the intent of 7.1.4 to ensure that MCTS can test software and data updates to the vendor provided system without impacting live operations?

Answer: Yes

22b. Is the intent of 7.1.4 to allow MCTS to update other 3rd party systems integrated to the proposed solution and not provided by the vendor, without impacting live operations?

Answer: CAD AVL vendor would be responsible for updates / patches to systems in their control and any interface patches / update in their control. Patches to systems they integrate with by those systems vendors are not the intent of this item.

One more addendum will be released next week, MTS will revisit the proposal due date at the time of that release. No further questions will be accepted the answers on addenda 5 are for questions that were received prior to the question deadline.

RFP NO: MM-06-20

Please sign and return one copy with the RFP Documents.

We acknowledge receipt of Addendum #4.

Name

Company Name

Signature

Date