



Robert P. Astorino
County Executive

Department of Public Works and Transportation

Vincent F. Kopicki, P.E.
Commissioner

Responses to Requests for Clarification

For

Request For Proposals

For

Consulting Services for a System Integration Project for Transit Operations

1: The section for notarization lists as the State as “State of New York”, does this mean the manager or managing member must be present in the State of New York to have this document notarized?

No. The notary notarizing the document for you should feel free to modify that section to recite the state in which the notarization takes place.

2: Is it possible to have the document notarized in the State of Florida?

Yes. Please see the response to #1, above.

3: The duty to defend language in Section III – Legal, C.) Contract, 1.) Insurance, Indemnification and Defense, (b), is a deal-breaker for us, and unless it is changed to something reasonable, we will not be able to propose on this opportunity. The duty to defend is absolute, and the Contractor would have to pay the entire cost of the defense of the County, even if the Contractor is not negligent. Further, “indirectly arising out of this Agreement” is vague and therefore disconcerting in that a duty to defend should only be invoked if a cause of action clearly points to the services under the Agreement. Will the County offer revised language in terms of the duty to defend?

This is not a request for clarification of the terms of the RFP. The County’s terms are specified in the RFP.

Bee Line System
County Airport (HPN)
100 East First Street

Mount Vernon, New York 10550 Telephone: (914) 813-7700 Fax: (914) 813-8027 Website: transportation.westchestergov.com



4: Would the County allow for a lump sum estimate for the first 2 phases and negotiate the remainder based on the selected SOW, as the scale and level of effort can vary.

No. In order to comply with the County's Procurement Policy, the County must procure now, and memorialize in any resulting contract, the cost terms.

5: Please clarify the schedule for the future County Radio system upgrade to P25 Phase 2 voice system. Details such as schedule, vendor, and system description/requirements are needed.

As stated in Section II(C) of the RFP, "the County desires to proceed with, and conclude, all of the solicited work as quickly as reasonably possible, in order to ensure that the County has migrated from UHF T-Band, and has integrated its systems in the manner described above, by any deadline set by federal law or regulation for such migration." The precise schedule that is used will be necessitated by the FCC regulations, both current and proposed, which affect the County's ability to continue using UHF T-Band.

The other requested details are already specified in Section II of the RFP.

6: Will CAD drawings be expected as part of the deliverables? Drawings for construction?

The County anticipates that it is likely that CAD drawings will prove to be useful in the successful proposer's full performance of the work under any agreement resulting from this RFP.

7: What spectrum the UNF T-Band licenses used by the existing county radio system will be relocated to?

Unless the FCC ultimately allows the County to remain on UHF T-Band, the CRS is going to be re-located to a P25 Phase 2 technology system, as specified in the RFP.

8: Would the County provide a week extension to the due date so as to allow sufficient time for proposal development after publishing responses to clarifications?

The new due date for proposals will be Friday, March 24, 2017 at 4:00 P.M. Please see the amendment that will be separately issued and posted to the County's website for RFPs.

9: Is the scope restricted to CAD/AVL and radio technologies or does it include a broader range of transit technologies (maintenance management, fuel management, fare systems, traveler information, TSP etc.).

The scope of work is limited to the integration of the TCS and future CRS, as specified in the RFP. However, during the system configuration alternative analysis, the various capabilities of different technologies and their respective abilities to make other features available in the future (e.g., WiFi, traveler information, etc.) will have to be analyzed by, and presented to the County by, the successful proposer.

10: Would the Phase 1 alternatives analysis also consider cellular alternatives for voice and/or data?

As specified in Section II(B) of the RFP, yes, cellular system configurations are to be considered for data (i.e., the CAD/AVL TCS). However, the voice system will remain on radio band, using P25 Phase 2 Technology.

11: As part of this project, would you anticipate any sort of interface or integration with systems owned and/or operated by Metro-North, NYMTA or other neighboring or partner agencies?

No, not at this time, except for integration with the current MetroCard farebox system and, as noted in the RFP, the MTA's replacement for MetroCard.

12: Under evaluation criteria (also listed under Schedule A): "MetroCard farebox system interfaces to onboard Xerox equipment" is a Westchester-specific requirement. Please clarify whether the integration experience with similar fare collection and CAD/AVL vendor (including Xerox) will be considered.

As the County currently operates Xerox equipment and has an integration with the MetroCard farebox system, and since replacement of the Xerox equipment is not a guaranteed outcome of this RFP, the County believes that experience with those specific things is particularly useful. Therefore, the County is only interested in such experience in response to the applicable questions in Schedule "A", and will evaluate each proposer's responses accordingly based on the evaluation criteria specified in the RFP.

13: Are there any known coverage issues with the radio system? Is there an expectation under Phase 1 to analyze converge for voice and/or data?

The County currently has a consultant analyzing the coverage of the existing UHF T-Band system and will make that report (when finished) available to the successful proposer, as necessary, for its review in conjunction with the work solicited by this RFP. However, cellular coverage issues are anticipated to be studied under any contract resulting from this RFP.

14: Are data channels dedicated to data communications needs of OrbCAD or shared by County for any other services?

The data channels are not used by the County for any services other than transit operations.

15: Under Schedule A, please clarify the extent of FCC regulation knowledge/experience that is desired.

The County expects proposers to have experience with all pertinent FCC regulations now in effect, as well as any pertinent proposed or pending FCC regulations. However, beyond that, the County does not have a specific desired level of experience with FCC regulations. The County simply needs to be informed of the proposer's level of experience with FCC regulations, so that the County can evaluate the proposer on that basis. As indicated by the evaluation criteria, more experience is desirable. In sum, the proposer should express and explain its experience with FCC regulations sufficient for the County to be able to readily understand the quantity and quality of the experience and evaluate it accordingly.

16: Would you please provide information on the anticipated timeline for the radio deployment.

As explained in response to #5, above, as stated in Section II(C) of the RFP, “the County desires to proceed with, and conclude, all of the solicited work as quickly as reasonably possible, in order to ensure that the County has migrated from UHF T-Band, and has integrated its systems in the manner described above, by any deadline set by federal law or regulation for such migration.” The precise schedule that is used will be necessitated by the FCC regulations, both current and proposed, which affect the County’s ability to continue using UHF T-Band.

17: Is Gold Elite console fully integrated with OrbCAD or dispatchers use both consoles as separate systems?

The dispatchers use the Motorola Gold Elite consoles for voice communication via the Motorola trunked radio system. The Motorola trunked radio system and the OrbCAD system are integrated as needed in order for the trunked radio system to be used for voice communication when requested by OrbCAD system.

18: Does DPW&T have an ongoing maintenance contract with Conduent (formerly ACS/Xerox)? If so, when does that contract expire?

Yes. The contract’s term expires on August 7, 2018.

19: Please clarify expectations for flat fee price proposal under Phases 2-4 given at this point system alternatives and procurement direction is unclear.

Please see the County’s response to #4, above.

20: Do we have to use Schedule B for submitting the price proposal or an alternative format that provides requested information can be used?

As specified in Schedule “A”, yes, each proposer must use Schedule “B” for its price proposal.

21: In the price proposal, is it fair to assume that hourly rates by labor category can be submitted? Price form currently has placeholder for only one hourly rate.

Yes, for the “ADDITIONAL WORK” category, different hourly rates can be proposed for different labor categories. Please see the amendment that will be separately issued and posted to the County’s website for RFPs, which will specify the following labor classifications for the “ADDITIONAL WORK” category: principal (or equivalent), manager/project manager (or equivalent), engineering designer (or equivalent), engineering technician (or equivalent).

22: Please clarify DBE/SBE/MBE requirement for this project

It is unclear exactly what is meant by this inquiry. The County does not anticipate using any federal funding to pay for any contract resulting from this RFP. As specified in Section III(G) of the RFP, the proposer complete the questionnaire attached to the RFP as Schedule “D.” Also, as specified in Section III(C)(3) of the RFP:

“Each proposer accepts and agrees that, if selected by the County, it will be asked to sign a contract containing the following, or language in substantially the following, form:

...

3.) COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS

“The Contractor shall comply, at its own expense, with the provisions of all applicable local, state and federal laws, rules and regulations, including, but not limited to, those applicable to the Contractor as an employer of labor. The Contractor shall further comply, at its own expense, with all applicable rules, regulations and licensing requirements pertaining to its professional status and that of its employees, partners, associates, subcontractors and others employed to render the Work hereunder.”