



RFP CET 23-03: Video Surveillance System for CET Fleet **Addendum 1: Pre-proposal conference notes**

Prepared by: Eric Lint, Strategy + Program Manager; and Kimberly Banner, Executive Coordinator

Date: April 28, 2023

Notice

The deadline for questions/Requests For Information from vendors has been extended to **Friday, May 5, 2023, at 4pm PDT** to allow time to consider the responses in this addendum.

An additional addendum will be released the week of May 1 providing responses to written questions that were received on or prior to April 25.

COIC's deadline to provide responses to all submitted questions is extended to May 12. The deadline for vendors to submit complete proposals remains May 19, 2023.

Background

COIC hosted a pre-proposal conference on April 18, 2023, to provide an opportunity for vendors to ask questions and clarify CET's requirements issued in RFP CET 23-03. This document attempts to capture the questions asked and responses given by COIC and CET. The answers recorded here may not be comprehensive in capturing the conversations that took place. Vendors will have to opportunity to continue submitting Requests For Information until May 5, 2023, at 4pm PDT.

The notes contained in this Addendum may be considered to supersede the requirements stated in RFP CET 23-03.

Addendum 2 will separately present vehicle details and photographs taken as part of the site visit that followed the pre-proposal conference.

CET Responses by RFP Section

3.1 – Concerning ongoing maintenance support

CET is requesting ongoing maintenance and support as a part of this procurement for up to five years. Section 4.7 describes some standards for support expected by CET. Vendors should clearly describe the levels of support offered as part of their proposal, to include optional tiers where available.

4.2.A-B – Replacement fleet may have systems installed by manufacturer

Where this section and Attachment A.1 describe replacement vehicles and vehicles yet to join the CET fleet, a “clean install” is mentioned, meaning an installation on a vehicle with no existing video system hardware present.

To clarify, vendors may propose installation as an optional cost to these new vehicles on the Price Proposal sheet located at the bottom of page 42. However, installation may in some cases instead occur at point of vehicle manufacture. The availability of this option may be dependent on separate procurement terms between CET and those vehicle vendors.

Vendors making offers for the present procurement may describe how installation can be supported in any of these cases – vendor provided installation, CET self-installation, or vehicle builder installation. Vendors should include any supporting documentation or examples of past performance in their response.

4.2.C – Reusing parts on the existing systems

Parts in the existing system may be reused insofar as they meet the standards specified in this RFP – to include expected lifetime. Vendors must identify any parts to be reused as part of their proposal if factored into the proposed system at time of proposal. Additional parts may be identified for reuse later during an assessment performed following award.

CET does not expect existing DVRs, cameras, or server/computer equipment to be suitable for reuse. CET has identified the panic button model on existing systems as potentially suitable for reuse. Other vehicle components such as the Pepwave may be “reused” or integrated with the camera system if vendor can verify that both are compatible without adverse impacts.

4.3.B – Daily operating hours per vehicle; minimum disk size

CET’s fleet typically operates 11 hours per day (7am-6pm), six days per week (Monday through Saturday). Certain vehicles may be subject to different schedules or hours, but this figure may be used for estimating purposes in the present RFP.

Regarding the disk size for DVR storage media, there is no stated minimum disk size in this RFP. Rather, CET requires disk sizes adequate to meet the standards for video duration and quality (including bitrate) specified in this section and it is the vendor’s responsibility to ensure adequate storage is supplied. It is suggested that vendors offer storage sizes meeting the full requirements and offer optional hardware if different sizes may be more economical.

Cascades East Transit

Additionally, CET prefers expandable storage options where possible. For example, if a vehicle starts with a 4TB drive but goes into heavier use, it may make sense to upgrade to an 8TB drive later.

4.3.C – Whether cameras will continuously operate at the stated specification

CET requires the *capability* to record at the stated specifications. However, CET may choose in practice, due to operational need, to adjust recording settings across a vehicle configuration to settings deviating from the standard specified in this RFP, such as reducing bitrate or framerate on two out of eight cameras (for example). Vendors may note where alternate settings or configurations would represent a best recommended solution, but any components not meeting this standard of capability should be noted as a deviation.

4.3.I – Splash-proof enclosure

Where this requirement describes a splash-proof enclosure for the DVR unit (separate from cameras), it does not necessarily require the unit itself to meet a specific water resistance standard (eg, IP-68) and the splash proofing may be obtained by enclosure in an existing onboard electrical cabinet. All low-floor transit bus models in the CET fleet are equipped with qualifying large electrical cabinets. Mid-size cutaway vehicles have small overhead bays where a DVR may be stored if the DVR unit's dimensions allow. Small vans also have a stowage area but may in some cases require a separate enclosure. (Measurements to be included in Addendum 2.)

Including an enclosure as an optional component is recommended.

While an existing onboard electrical cabinet may meet the requirement of this section, the DVR itself will still need its own locking mechanism(s) to meet the tamper resistance required here.

Additionally, all camera units (separate from DVRs) must themselves be splash and tamper resistant per 4.4.K.

4.3.J – Operating temperature range

The operating temperature range noted in this RFP (-20°F-140°F) was “borrowed” from specifications for an older analog camera system. CET understands that modern IP camera systems may offer operating temperature ranges less than this standard.

Vendors may propose DVRs or camera systems deviating from this range, but should clearly specify the safe operating temperature for the proposed units. Vendors may consider that DVRs will likely operate inside a climate-controlled cabin and describe safe installation conditions. Additionally, any relevant support or warranty terms should be highlighted.

For reference, weather conditions in CET's Central Oregon service area have reached temperatures as high as 118°F and as low as -8°F in recent years.

4.3.O – Types of notifications via the panic button

The panic button model (Seon P/N 065-0096) described as already existing within the CET fleet in this section offers limited notification options via a color-coded light – green for an operational system, red to indicate errors. Section 4.3.V calls for an onboard status indicator to

Cascades East Transit

alert the vehicle operator. The existing panic button's simple red/green indicator may meet this standard if the vendor's system is able to provide error notices to the button.

An error state displayed to the vehicle operator via the panic button light or similar should lead to the more detailed error reporting available via the system client called for in Section 4.3.V. Any panic button proposed to replace the existing buttons – or tablets, displays, or other systems – should include this basic error status indicator at minimum.

For example, the panic button should produce an error notification if a single onboard camera is malfunctioning. The type of notification provided to the vehicle operator by the button in this case may simply be turning its indicator light from green to red without identifying the specific camera impacted. The specific camera malfunctioning should then be identifiable on the administrator's client/dashboard or other diagnostic methods.

4.3.P – CAD/AVL integration

Where this item offers the CAD/AVL system as an example of an onboard system that may be integrated in the DVR's metadata, integration of the CAD/AVL system is not specifically required and may in fact be redundant with a DVR's integrated GPS data. We regret the confusion.

To further clarify this requirement, CET's priority for metadata are the items stated in 4.3.M, such as GPS data which may be obtained separately from the AVL system, and vehicle data that may be hardwired into the DVR, such as pedal and signal status.

It is recommended that vendors make note of any other systems compatible with proposed DVRs or plans for such integration to include an expected timeline to operational availability.

For the record, CET's CAD/AVL systems are obtained through Passio and Ecolane.

4.3.T – Daily recording uploads

This item calls for power systems to support transfer of "a full day's recordings." CET understands that it is not economical to routinely offload *all* recorded video from a vehicle. This requirement refers to the need for a full day's *flagged events* to be offloaded automatically. However, this item does intend that a system *should* be capable of offloading a large video that may be hours long from multiple cameras – for example, in the event of a prolonged emergency situation.

4.3.U – Remote live viewing not necessary; existing cellular connectivity

Where this item calls for "data review in the field" it does not require remote live viewing. Rather, this requirement is meant to allow an authorized user in close proximity to the DVR unit, such as at the scene of an accident on a rural road, to view video from the DVR directly without first being uploaded to a central client. That may be obtained by wireless connectivity to a device, wired output to a device or monitor, or other means. Constant, live access from remote locations (such as a staff member at CET's Redmond office in the above accident scenario) via cellular networks is not strictly required but may be proposed as an option.

For the record, CET's vehicles use the Pepwave Max Transit Mini (MAX-TST-MINI-LTE-F-T-PRM) for live connectivity to CAD/AVL and other onboard systems over Verizon cellular networks. A video surveillance system may have the option of using this device only insofar as it does not

Cascades East Transit

interfere with other onboard system operations. Vendors proposing this option should note the feature's requirements to ensure compatibility.

4.3.V – System status indicator

In addition to the indicator available for the vehicle operator, the DVR unit itself may include status indicators such as lights that change color or blink to indicate response codes. This section calls for the DVR unit to be capable of performing self-diagnostics and reporting. However, beyond the simple indicators already described, the detailed result of that system diagnostic should be reported via the system client described in Section 4.6, to include push notifications of some kind (email and/or SMS).

For example, if a single camera on a vehicle is non-responsive, this problem should trigger the simple onboard alert indicator to the vehicle operator, send a push notification to specified addresses, and provide specific details on the system client where the affected camera will be specified along with any specific error codes or issue categories (eg, power failure, network issue, etc).

4.4.E – View of lift areas, microphones

A vendor asked whether a view of the lift area can be provided by an internal camera and whether a microphone is needed on the exterior of the vehicle. CET's current camera configuration includes an external side view camera capturing the lift area and an internal camera that captures the lift area.

External cameras do not currently include microphones and capturing audio external to the vehicle is not specified as a requirement in this RFP. However, vendors may include such features as part of a proposed or optional system.

4.5.A.d.ii – Rear view does not require back up monitor capability

Throughout this RFP, where there is a request for external rear-facing cameras ("rear/road behind"), it is not a requirement for a backup monitor capability. Rather, this should be treated like all other cameras in the system which are meant primarily for surveillance purposes. A vendor may propose rear cameras that function as backup monitors, but this is not a specific need from CET and not a requirement of this RFP.

4.5.B – Number of IP cameras to include

This model configuration describes a system using 4 IP cameras. The RFP states a preference for IP cameras both for improved quality and future-proofing the system. However, CET understands a fully IP-based system may not always be the most economical solution. Therefore, this model demonstrates a hybrid configuration. That said, all models are not a strict requirement, but rather conceptual plans to better explain CET's expectations while allowing flexibility. Vendors may offer a best recommended configuration and alternative configurations including a different number of IP cameras.

Throughout the RFP, CET's priority is providing adequate, quality coverage of the required zones (driver area, etc). The number of cameras needed to obtain this coverage is not strictly defined and is subject to vendor's proposed technology.

4.5.C.a – Whether a dash cam may be acceptable

The model configuration for small vans notes that a “modified dash cam type unit” may be acceptable. As above, CET’s priority is for quality coverage of the required zones, so a more compact unit with fewer cameras may be capable of serving these smaller vehicles.

A point of clarification is needed regarding the recording capacity of these smaller units: CET understands that most dash cam type units use smaller, removable storage such as a micro-SD card. The minimum requirement for onboard video retention (240 hours) still holds for these devices. The minimum requirement for video retention refers to total recorded hours per day, not solely flagged events. The full day’s recording is helpful, for example, to demonstrate when a reported event (such as a driver interaction) in fact did not occur. Vendors may propose items meeting a lower retention standard and note it as a deviation with an explanation.

4.6.F – Preference for a cloud-based solution

A vendor noted the language of this item included “strongly prefers” – rather than simply “prefers” – regarding a cloud-based storage and management system. To elaborate, CET’s preference for a cloud-based solution is rooted mainly in a desire to reduce the need for CET staff time dedicated to maintenance and administration of the system (local server security, for example). This value is now integrated across all COIC and CET procurements.

Cloud-based systems are not required and CET may consider locally-hosted solutions. Hybrid systems may offer a good value while still meeting some of the objectives in this preference. Vendors should clearly explain how their systems operate, which components are cloud-based, and include full and/or variable costs. Vendors are additionally encouraged to highlight efficiencies in their system that might speak to the spirit of this objective whether cloud-based or not.

4.6.R – Unique camera identifier

Where this section calls for advanced search and display options, “camera identification/serial number” is noted. This does not need to be the camera hardware unit’s unique serial number from the factory, but rather may be a unique identifier issued as part of this procurement and installation. The specification for this section calls for individual cameras to be capable of quick selection and identification for evidentiary purposes. For example, “bus 75 front dash” or an encoded system to be determined (eg, 75-F-01).

4.6.T – Requiring a type of push notification for errors

This section calls for the client to be configured to send “text and email alerts to system administrators”. The language here is now changed to “text and/or email alerts” to provide greater flexibility.

CET understands that texting systems may incur additional charges. SMS texting is not strictly required if another form of push notification is available. If a system includes push alerts via the client dashboard or mobile app, it must also include text and/or email alerts. Text or email alerts may be simple, directing an administrator to the client for more detailed information.

It is recommended that vendors describe the full set of alert options, including integration with other systems, and describe any new features planned as near-term additions to their system.

Cascades East Transit

4.8.I – Should site assessments include wireless internet capabilities?

CET's IT administrator, Jeff Hamilton, clarified during this conference that CET will be upgrading its network architecture including the wireless internet access points to be used as a part of this video surveillance system. A vendor asked whether the site assessments performed under this requirement should still include an assessment of CET's wireless internet capabilities considering that.

A full assessment of the wireless internet architecture may not be necessary except insofar as to ensure system compatibility. Vendors may advise CET that upgrades will be needed at the time of assessment, but should nonetheless clearly describe minimum network requirements for their system's optimal functionality in the RFP response.

CET's current system operates on a gigabit fiber connection and includes long range wireless broadband antennas in the fleet yard.

4.9 – Project schedule

A vendor asked for clarification on the project schedule: will certain vehicle types have their installations occur at the same time or will any vehicle be put forward for installation on an as available basis?

CET's goal and priority is to complete installations for the larger vehicles first: low-floor transit buses will be prioritized. Like vehicles may be scheduled together for efficiencies (a value shared by CET) insofar as operational need allows. The ability to conduct installation on the weekends may help ensure critical vehicles can be serviced on a timely schedule and should be highlighted with any proposal offering such.

To further clarify the project schedule, CET's preferred target date for completion is late October being mindful that Central Oregon experiences extreme winter weather conditions typically starting in November. Installation does require system testing and acceptance per 4.9.E. CET has committed to providing at least two vehicles per day for installation per 4.9.D, subject to operational need. Per 4.8.B, vendors may provide installation services through their own staff or contracted labor as an optional cost or CET may arrange for installation separately.

4.10.A – On-site support and warranty service

A vendor asked if on-site support and warranty service is required to meet CET's needs or whether a 24/7 phone support service may qualify. Vendors are encouraged to describe their full range of service and support options, especially relating to warranty claims.

Central Oregon is three hours from the nearest large city. CET has experienced service interruptions in the past due to warranty claims requiring vehicles being sent to Eugene or Salem for service. CET strongly prefers minimizing service interruptions and desires clear warranty and support terms. CET does have staff mechanics and IT technicians.

Exhibit C – Vendors may reference prepared materials

It was clarified that vendors do not necessarily need to provide an original narrative statement to the questions posed in Exhibit C. Vendors may reference attached prepared materials in place of a narrative response. However, a quality response will provide clear and brief context as needed to explain how and why those materials are relevant to CET's unique circumstances.

General Questions

Proposal evaluation and total cost of ownership

A vendor asked specifically whether a contract for cloud services would be factored in the total cost of ownership over five years. All proposed services will be factored into the total cost of ownership. Where discrete pricing may not yet be available for goods or services in future years, an escalation factor may be offered (eg, “3% increase per year” or “Annual adjustment at a percentage equal to the increase in PPI WPS107.”). Proposals will be evaluated based on the offered packages that best represent the needs of CET in the judgement of each member of CET’s evaluation committee. Additionally, the availability and pricing of optional components or services may be considered by the evaluation committee.

Replacement vehicle schedule

A vendor asked when CET expects to bring on replacement vehicles and whether installation of the video surveillance system may take place at one time on those vehicles. Unfortunately, a schedule for the arrival of replacement vehicles is not available at this time and subject to ongoing procurement efforts. At the time of this conference, CET has two open procurements for vehicles and is additionally pursuing grant awards to obtain more. Based on conversations with vehicle manufacturers, lingering supply chain effects may mean new vehicles purchased in these procurements can be more than twelve months away from delivery.

Vendors may arrange for video surveillance systems to be installed on new vehicles at point of manufacture and should note in their proposal any experience coordinating installations in this way.

Whether cabling onboard vehicles may be reused

As most cameras in the current fleet are analog, the existing cabling onboard retrofit vehicles may not be suitable for all proposed configurations. A complete inventory of existing camera types and placements is not available and vendors should assume all existing cameras and cabling are analog.

Pricing sheet – manipulate line items or add lines

The pricing sheets provided by CET are meant to broadly standardize the pricing scheme to allow consistency in evaluation and scoring among CET’s evaluation committee. For this reason, vendors should attempt to remain as close as possible to this format in completing the pricing sheet.

Vendors may add lines to the pricing sheet where appropriate in offering greater detail. Certain sections of the pricing sheet anticipate this with a blank line before the subtotal line. A version of CET’s pricing sheet is included in the [MS Word-formatted package of editable forms](#) (an aide to preparing a response and customizing the pricing sheets). Vendors may additionally attach their own pricing/quote sheets showing a detailed breakdown of components in each package.

Sample contract available for legal review?

A vendor asked whether COIC/CET has a sample contract available for review prior to submitting a proposal. This is not available at this time. Any contract will be drafted following award responsive to the proposal’s specific contents.

Cascades East Transit

Estimated budget

It is not COIC policy to release project budgets during an open procurement. COIC and CET are in part grant funded government organizations and as such budget availability may be subject to change (increase or decrease).

Optimal start and completion dates

The schedule outlined at the top of the RFP relates only to the procurement process. The “expected contract start date” of June 15th refers to the beginning of the project proper, which may start with site surveys and design review as specified in 4.9.K. CET would optimally prefer that hardware installations on vehicles occur through late Summer to Fall and be complete before November.

Networking details

Several questions were asked regarding the existing network architecture and server configurations. To reiterate, the bulk of the items that comprise COIC’s network architecture are scheduled for replacement in the near term separate from this procurement. Network upgrades are expected to be completed concurrently with the project plan for this procurement and may be available by the time video surveillance systems are ready for use.

Vendors are encouraged to state minimum or recommended requirements for optimal system performance to CET. If a vendor provides clear details on the proposed system’s network requirements for optimal performance, COIC may modify their planned network upgrades to accommodate any such needs or purchase components through the present RFP.

Vendors may include networking equipment in their core proposal, offer it as optional components, or simply provide minimum recommended specifications for optimal performance that CET may then separately procure.

Networking Summary

The current video surveillance system requires use of an on-premises server. The server is located in Bend at Hawthorne Station. Vehicles at CET’s Bear Creek and Antler locations upload flagged events to the server over a VPN connection on gigabit fiber. Video that has not been flagged may be retrieved on-demand when the vehicle is in range of a CET network. The existing server runs Windows Server 2008 and is not recommended for continued use. The wireless access points in current use are suitable for continued use and CET will assume liability for any needed upgrades to the wireless access point that provides connectivity to vehicles in the fleet yards.

Complete details available at the COIC website

This document is an addendum to RFP CET 23-03 providing official responses to vendor questions posed during pre-proposal conferences with CET staff.

Find full details regarding RFP CET 23-03 at the COIC website:

Cascades East Transit

<https://www.coic.org/open-procurements/>

