Cascades East Transit
Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council
334 NE Hawthorne Ave, Bend, OR 97701
cascadeseasttransit.com

RFP CET 25-04 Vendor Question Responses

5/21/2025

The questions below were received by COIC between May 15 to 21, 2025. The questions were received from multiple vendors and are presented in the order they were received. Vendor questions are included verbatim in **bold text,** and COIC's response is immediately below the question.

#	Questions
1	**Please confirm if it's acceptable for the Proposer to electronically sign the proposal documents using a tool such as DocuSign** Yes, they can be signed electronically through DocuSign.
2	**Please confirm if the RFP due date can be extended by four weeks to provide the Bidder with sufficient time to prepare their RFP response** The due date for proposals will remain June 9, 2025, at 4 pm PDT.
3	**Please provide the Passio CAD/AVL specification for integration.** The CAD/AVL solution provided by Passio includes GPS, GTFS, Mobile Data Terminals (MDT), service alerts, a customer service gateway, and more features. Additionally, each vehicle is equipped with PepWave mobile data connections with open Ethernet ports available for new systems to be added to the vehicle. Fare systems may obtain certain information, such as GPS location at time of validation, independently or from the AVL system if compatible. However, any such integration possible with existing systems is desired. For example, the fare system should refer to support comments through the existing contact form managed by Passio. Likewise, the fare system may ingest GTFS-RT feeds provided by Passio to make real-time information available to customers.
4	**Is there a specific funding or operational deadline that is driving the 90-day go-live schedule?** COIC desires to begin collecting fares in October 2025 and requires a fare collection system ready by this time.

5	**Would CET consider a flexible approach to the 90-day desired schedule, and allow vendors to propose a 'best approach' recommended schedule?** CET/COIC's preference is to begin fare collection in October of 2025, however, CET will review vendors who submit alternative schedule proposals based on a best approach proposal. The director and evaluation committee still prefer proposals that meet the schedule listed, but will review alternate proposed timeframes at our discretion.
6	**Please confirm the exact number of validators that need to be priced for hardware and installations. (i.e., fleet of 76 is listed, but 8 vans may not be included, but 8 new vehicles are to be expected later. A fixed number may assist in pricing evaluations.)** Please provide pricing for **68 vehicles** as described in Section 1.2. N.i-iii under Initial System Build Out Costs under Exhibit A. Equipment for the 8 Ford Transit vans mentioned in Section 1.2. N.iv should be included as an optional price under the Initial System Build Out. Then, the 8 new vehicles mentioned in Section 1.2. N.c should be explicitly priced under Future Expansion Costs with a fixed cost for 2026 delivery. Finally, pricing for the undetermined number of expansion fleet is mentioned in Section 1.2. N.d should also be listed under Future Expansion Costs, but these may be priced at a per vehicle rate with an escalation factor for future years noted. Any minimum unit terms should be noted in the response as well (such as "minimum order of 4 units for on-site installation to be offered").
7	**Regarding the 5 "mobility hubs", is CET currently utilizing a Microtransit or On-demand solution that requires integration for this project?** Per Section 1.2.G, CET is currently operating on-demand services using Ecolane software: "CET intends to process fares for these services through Ecolane and does not intend to immediately include fare validation devices on vehicles used exclusively for these on-demand services. However, CET reserves the right to purchase validation devices and add these vehicles to the fare collection system in the future. Any system integration available with Ecolane should be described by the vendor." The "mobility hubs" are more commonly known as "community transit centers" and are expected to offer Ticket Vending Machines (TVM) compatible with the fare collection system obtained under this procurement. TVM are being procured

	separately from this current solicitation. On-demand service vehicles may utilize mobility hubs for passenger pick-up and drop-off.
8	**Does CET have an existing PSP provider, or should vendors recommend utilizing their own payment service provider?** Vendors are encouraged to include payment service provider (PSP) services or recommend their own payment service providers, including a complete description of terms and fees. Vendors should make clear whether use of their recommended PSP is required or optional, and any additional considerations or impacts if COIC should choose a different PSP. CET currently uses Chase Bank Paymentech with its Umo fare collection system. This is not required and may be replaced with a vendor-recommended PSP offering more favorable terms or integrations. CET also currently uses Square for a relatively small number of payments received via the service counter at Hawthorne Station. This is also not required and may be replaced by the vendor's recommended solution.
9	**Are vendors to include pricing for physical fare cards? (If so, please confirm the quantity needed)** Yes. COIC expects an initial order quantity of 5,000 physical fare cards.
10	**Is the UMO solution being replaced as part of this project?** Yes. If another vendor is awarded a contract under this procurement, that vendor will fully replace the existing solution currently provided by Umo.
11	**If UMO is to remain, are vendors to consider any integration with their existing platform?** Per the response to Question 10, the Umo provided solution will be fully replaced by the successful bidder under this procurement.
12	**Is CET using a Consultant for this procurement? If yes, can you share the name of the Consultant?** No. CET is conducting this procurement entirely in-house.
13	**Pending CET's answers to questions, will CET allow a second round of questions if further clarification is needed?**

	Questions may continue to be submitted until the deadline for questions listed on the RFP on Wednesday, May 21st, 2025, at 4:00 pm PDT.
14	**Please confirm that there are no bid or insurance bonds required for this project?** No bonds are required for this project, however, insurance is required as described in the RFP body with special attention to Exhibit K: Insurance Requirements.
15	**Do vendors need to price a mobile validator, or just provide information on the solution?** Per Section 1.6. C.b, vendors should describe any additional costs for the mobile validator as an optional cost.
16	**1.7.C.J. "The mobile app must support integration with trip planning applications…" Can vendors provide a native trip planning solution with our proposed App?** This is acceptable, and it is preferred that trip planning features be included inside the same vendor app where payment is completed. Section 1.7. C.j continues to say that integration "must be supported to the greatest extent possible" and is thus not strictly required. The intent of this section, however, is to enable tickets to be purchased inside third-party apps, such as Google Maps or a TNC vendor app, whenever possible. As such, this integration is not required, but COIC desires to understand the extent to which the vendor supports such uses.
17	**If vendors are to integrate a 3rd party trip planner into the app, please provide details on the requirement and 3rd party for integration and/or potential fees.** Third-party trip planner integration is not strictly required. CET's goal in seeking trip planner integration with the fare payment system is to aid riders in selecting the appropriate fare for their journey, and making this possible with the fewest number of apps on the rider's mobile device to accomplish this. Per Section 1.7. C.g, a simple menu of fares inside the vendor's app may suffice. However, any further integrations – whether a native offering in-app or an optional feature in addition to the vendor app should be clearly described. Any fees for this integration should be included in pricing.
18	**Is there any existing hardware validation devices on buses currently and will this impact the 90-day timeline for go-live?** Fewer than half of the vehicles in CET's revenue fleet are currently equipped with fare validators. The validators are an older generation model leased from

	Cubic/Umo and are expected to be fully replaced through this procurement and returned to Cubic.
19	**Given the 90-day timeline for go-live, is the agency open to a phased launch with visual validation mobile ticketing as phase 1 and validator launch as phase 2? 90 days is a very difficult timeline to achieve for anyone in this space with international shipping and custom installation.** CET/COIC's preference is to begin fare collection in October of 2025, however, CET will review vendors who submit alternative schedule proposals based on a best approach proposal. The director and evaluation committee still prefer proposals that meet the schedule listed, but will review alternate proposed timeframes at our discretion. Any best approach proposal may include phased delivery or alternate implementations to be considered at CET's discretion.
20	**Is it possible to add cooperative purchasing language to this agreement to allow other agencies to benefit from this procurement?** This may be acceptable to COIC pending further legal review. The State of Oregon allows government contracting authorities to enter into or sponsor cooperative procurements, and any contractual clauses following award must meet these state standards. See, for example, ORS 279A.205 and ORS 279A.215.
21	**Can you please clarify if CET provides K-12 school students with free rides in conjunction with area public schools? This model can be used to augment or as a substitute for a school system's dedicated school bus fleet.** This is not currently a part of CET's fare policy. Student rate fares are offered, and schools may enter into agreements for group rates, but there is no current policy supporting the "one bus for all" model where public transit may replace school buses operated by the local school district. There has been discussion at the state level about supporting fare-free rides for youth under 18, supported by state subsidies, as has recently been implemented in Washington State, however, this remains a discussion only at this time.
22	**With an understanding that farebox replacement is not in scope, can you please provide high-level information on the existing fareboxes, such as are they electronic or manual and do they collect fare data today?** To clarify, CET desires fare validation devices onboard each vehicle as described in the RFP. These devices may be capable of open-loop payment, but are not intended to collect cash payments.

	CET's current farebox and validator configuration includes a secure cash box and a separate Umo fare validator. Both the cash box and Umo validator will be removed and replaced with the vendor's proposed fare validation device.
23	**Again, with an understanding that farebox replacement is not in scope, can you please clarify if the existing fareboxes are required (or is a desired option) to interface with the vendor's proposed new fare collection system, such as providing CET with a central view/report of all fare collection data including both from the fareboxes and AFC system? This will help us understand if there are any needs for cash fare reporting that CET would like vendors to help address.** As mentioned in response to Question 22, both the existing cash box and fare validator will be removed from each vehicle and replaced with the vendor's proposed fare validation device. However, CET will still handle cash at select customer service locations, via ticket vending machines, and through partner agreements. CET desires a backend reporting system that is capable of displaying purchase channel or location information for fare products not purchased through the vendor-provided app or purchasing platform.
24	**We observed that in the Technical Approach of the evaluation criteria, CET will be judging vendors on solutions that are appropriate to a variety of fare policies. Can CET please clarify some of the fare policy complexity they envision or challenges they may be facing?** A draft proposed fare policy is available on the CET website at this address: https://cascadeseasttransit.com/cet-announces-draft-fare-guidelines-for-public-comment/ Beyond the broad categories described in the proposed policy, CET desires a fare management system capable of best practices as they emerge, which take advantage of the technology. This includes features like dynamic fare capping at specific time periods (daily, weekly, monthly, annual, or other) or other perks available to riders using the account-based system. Challenges may include tracking eligibility for discounted fare classes and when the discount expires or needs to be renewed. This may be tracked outside of the fare system's software, but an integrated solution may provide advantages.
25	**Can the agency please describe the current process for customers to apply and be approved for discount fare classes?** These processes are currently being reviewed ahead of fare collection resuming in late 2025. Eligibility for discounted fare classes is always verified by CET staff and at

	present is not granted automatically (such as by use of a .edu email address or third-party verification like ID.me). Typically eligibility is verified in one of two ways: 1) Certain classes may be verified immediately by staff at one of CET's customer service locations, and the class applied to the rider's account. For example, a rider presenting a valid student identification would be granted student fare rates. 2) Other classes require an application form and further staff reviews. This is how paratransit service eligibility is processed, and discount fare classes may be granted through the same application and review process. CET may consider automation supporting eligibility verification if it is proposed by the vendor, accurate, and economical.
26	**Would you please clarify the intent of "2-3 page narrative description of the proposed Technical Approach" listed in "Exhibit M: Proposal Submission Checklist"? Specifically, is CET requesting a distinct document as a summary description of the technical approach, or is this intended to serve as a page limit to the "Technical Approach" section for the vendor response as listed in Section 3.3? If it is the latter, given both the length of the RFP requirements and the scoring importance of this section, we request that the page limit be removed to allow all vendors adequate space to comprehensively explain how we can address CET's requirements.** The intent of this requirement is for a customized narrative description of the proposed solution that is responsive to CET's specific and described needs and not a generic marketing package. This summary description does not have to be exhaustive in detail, and marketing materials or other documentation may be included or referenced. There is no page limit or restriction for this RFP response, but clarity is valued.
27	**Provided that proposals should be sectioned with titles and scope aligned to Section 3.3, would you please clarify where a description of the supplier's implementation plan should be provided?** The proposed implementation plan may be included under Technical Approach.
28	**What is the difference between "EXHIBIT L: Receipt of Addenda" Page 78 vs "ADDENDA Proposer has received and considered, in the accompanying proposal, the terms of the following addenda, if any:" Page 82**

	The line referenced on page 82 is duplicative of Exhibit L on page 78. So long as the proposer completes Exhibit L, they may enter simply "See Exhibit L" on the Addenda line for Exhibit P on page 82.
29	**What is the project budget?** Please submit your pricing proposal based on your cost of equipment, labor, and materials that will allow you to successfully execute the proposed scope of work. COIC will not disclose its total budget to maintain the integrity of the solicitation process.
30	**How many years is the initial contract and how many years is the optional renewal?** Defer to Bob/Michelle. I think we've previously done a 3-year contract, plus two option years?
31	**How many CET customer service locations are there?** There are currently two CET customer service locations, with plans for limited expansion of offerings either with CET staff or cooperative sales agreements. The primary location for in-person customer interactions is Hawthorne Station in Bend, where a full-service counter is present. CET's Antler Operations Center in Redmond houses the call center team and may provide more limited in-person service, focusing primarily on phone and online support. Ticket vending and third-party sales will also be available as described in the RFP text.
32	**Should a price quote include the following section "G. Scheduled on-demand services are managed using Ecolane software. CET intends to process fares for these services through Ecolane and does not intend to immediately include fare validation devices on vehicles used exclusively for these on-demand services. However, CET reserves the right to purchase validation devices and add these vehicles to the fare collection system in the future." Page 7** Per the response to Question 6 here, please provide pricing for 68 vehicles as described in Section 1.2. N.i-iii under Initial System Build Out Costs under Exhibit A. Equipment for the 8 Ford Transit vans mentioned in Section 1.2. N.iv should be included as an optional price under the Initial System Build Out.
33	**What is the difference between "E. Retail Portal." Page 18 vs "Reload Kiosks." page 14** The Retail Portal should be a web-based administrative panel for local businesses to manage direct sales of CET fare products at their location. This includes, for

	example, a hotel or drug store activating a new physical fare card and loading it with fare paid for by their customer at the same time the customer pays for other, non-fare goods or services. The Reload Kiosk, instead, is an unstaffed terminal or tablet that allows a rider to independently and securely manage certain aspects of their own account. This includes, for example, reloading fare onto a fare card already in their possession using a credit card.
34	**For exhibit a "new kiosk terminals," what are the specifications?** Please disregard and strike the mention of "new kiosk terminals" in the descriptive text under Future Expansion Costs in Exhibit A. Kiosk hardware will now be procured entirely separately from the current solicitation in an RFP yet to be published. Vendors are, however, encouraged to describe and price any software support for kiosk functionality that may operate on generic hardware per Section 1.6. C.b.
35	**What is the yearly farebox and mobile ticketing collection?** CET has not collected fares outside of limited recreational services for over five years. However, vendors may independently estimate prospective farebox figures with the aid of CET's Annual Ridership Report available on the CET website at: https://cascadeseasttransit.com/data/ This report includes farebox information for the recreational services where CET currently collects fares. Additionally, a proposed (not yet approved) fare policy is available for public viewing at this URL: https://cascadeseasttransit.com/cet-announces-draft-fare-guidelines-for-public-comment/