MASON TRANSIT AUTHORITY

RFP No. 2026-01
CAD/AVL, Scheduling, Dispatch & Passenger Information System

Consolidated Vendor Questions & Answers

Purpose. This consolidates overlapping vendor questions into topic-based questions for a single, consistent MTA response. Duplicate questions have been combined; this worksheet incorporates the final vendor question list received by MTA and consolidates repeated or substantially overlapping requests into a single response where practical.

1. Procurement, Submission & Contracting

Q1. Will MTA accept electronic proposal submissions?

Yes. MTA has authorized electronic proposal submission by addendum. Proposers must comply with the submission instructions established by that addendum.

Authorized September 3, 2026 – Addendum No. 1

Q2. Will MTA provide a Word or fillable PDF version of the RFP forms?

MTA will post a Microsoft Word version of the RFP on MTA's Procurement webpage

Q3. Attachment B includes a Pricing Form while Section 7.10 references a Cost Proposal. Are both required?

No, both are not required. The Attachment B pricing form will fulfill the Cost Proposal requirement.

Q4. Should proposers price the initial three-year term only, or all five potential contract years? How will price be evaluated?

For purposes of price comparison and evaluation, proposers should price the initial three-year contract term. Pricing for optional renewal periods may be identified separately where applicable but will not be included in the base price comparison unless otherwise specified by MTA.

Q5. May vendors propose selected components rather than the full solution, and may MTA make partial awards to different vendors?

Yes. The RFP permits proposals for individual components, multiple components, or a complete solution. MTA reserves the right to award all or part of the work in its best interest.

Q6. How will component-only proposals be evaluated, and will a turnkey solution receive an advantage for completeness?

Component-only proposals will be evaluated using the same applicable evaluation criteria identified in the RFP. Turnkey solutions will not receive an evaluation advantage solely based on offering a complete, single-vendor solution. MTA's objective is to select the solution, or combination of solutions, that best meets its operational needs and provides the greatest overall value to the agency, whether that is achieved through a turnkey solution, individual components, or an integrated multi-vendor approach.

Q7. Is a prime contractor with named subcontractors acceptable, and when is written approval of subcontractors required?

A prime contractor may propose named subcontractors. Proposers should clearly identify each subcontractor, its role, and the portion of work it will perform. Subcontracting remains subject to the requirements of the RFP and resulting contract.

Q8. Must each subcontractor independently carry all insurance required by Section 6.3?

Subcontractors are not required to independently maintain the insurance coverage specified in Section 6.3, provided they are appropriately covered under the prime contractor's insurance policies and such coverage meets all applicable requirements of Section 6.3. The prime contractor remains responsible for ensuring that all required insurance coverage is maintained throughout the term of the contract.

2. Vendor Qualifications, References & Washington Eligibility

Q9. Does MTA require a minimum number of years in business for the prime contractor?

MTA has not established a separate minimum number of years in business. MTA will evaluate demonstrated qualifications, relevant experience, successful comparable implementations, and the proposed project team.

Q10. May MTA consider experience of subcontractors, technology partners, affiliates, and proposed key personnel?

Yes, when clearly identified and relevant to the work proposed. The proposal should distinguish the experience of the prime contractor from that of subcontractors, partners, affiliates, and key personnel and explain each entity's proposed role.

Q11. How does MTA define projects of 'similar size and complexity' for experience and references?

MTA will consider overall comparability, including fleet size, service modes, operational complexity, technology scope, integrations, implementation requirements, and functionality. No single factor will determine whether a project is comparable.

Q12. May references include comparable public transportation, mobility, municipal, or regional agencies, and may phased or ongoing operational projects be used?

Yes, provided the referenced project is substantially comparable to the scope being proposed and is sufficiently implemented to allow the reference to meaningfully evaluate performance. The proposer must clearly describe the project's status and its role.

Q13. What documentation will MTA accept to demonstrate financial stability?

MTA will allow proposers to submit reasonable evidence demonstrating financial stability and the ability to successfully perform the resulting contract. Acceptable documentation may include, but is not limited to, audited or reviewed financial statements, bank or financial institution references, credit information, parent-company guarantees, or other documentation the proposer believes adequately demonstrates its financial capacity. MTA reserves the right to request additional financial information or clarification during the evaluation process, if necessary.

Q14. May an out-of-state vendor submit before completing Washington registrations?

Yes, provided the proposer obtains all registrations, licenses, and authorizations legally required to perform the contract before contract execution or commencement of services, as applicable.

Q15. May a proposer enter 'N/A' for Washington registration fields that do not apply?

Yes. A proposer may identify a field as not applicable when appropriate, but should provide a brief explanation.

3. DBE & Federal Requirements

Q16. Has MTA established a contract-specific DBE participation goal for this procurement?

No. MTA has not established a contract-specific DBE participation goal for this procurement. MTA remains committed to providing full and fair opportunities for DBE participation in accordance with its DBE Program and applicable federal requirements. DBE participation is encouraged, but no specific percentage goal has been established for this contract.

Q17. How does Buy America apply to software, cloud services, computing equipment, and onboard hardware under this solicitation?

FTA Buy America requirements will apply to this procurement to the extent applicable under 49 U.S.C. § 5323(j) and 49 CFR Part 661.

FTA maintains a general Buy America waiver for microprocessors, computers, microcomputers, software, and similar devices used solely for the purpose of processing or storing data. Accordingly, software and qualifying computer or data-processing equipment proposed under this procurement may be covered by the applicable general waiver.

The waiver does not automatically extend to all onboard equipment or other manufactured products merely because they contain a microprocessor or computer component. Proposers

are responsible for identifying the applicability of Buy America requirements and any applicable general waivers to the products and equipment included in their proposals and for providing the certifications required by the RFP.

MTA will evaluate Buy America compliance consistent with applicable FTA requirements, 49 CFR Part 661, and any applicable waivers in effect at the time of procurement.

4. Service & Fleet Profile

Q18. How are MTA's revenue vehicles distributed among fixed-route, commuter, and Dial-A-Ride/demand-response service, and what is peak vehicle usage by mode?

Based on current operating schedules, peak vehicle usage is approximately 9 vehicles for fixed-route service, 1 vehicle for commuter service, and 13 vehicles for Dial-A-Ride/demand-response service. Some vehicles are used across multiple service modes during the service day, so peak vehicle usage does not directly correspond to the number of vehicles assigned exclusively to each mode.

Q19. Are any vehicles shared between fixed-route and demand-response service?

Yes. MTA currently has some cutaway vehicles that are shared between fixed-route and demand-response service. As part of implementation, MTA anticipates transitioning toward more clearly defined fixed-route and demand-response vehicle assignments, particularly because vehicles assigned to fixed-route service may require additional onboard equipment such as APCs. MTA nevertheless wishes to retain reasonable operational flexibility for spare or emergency vehicle assignments. Final vehicle assignments and equipment quantities will be coordinated with the successful vendor during implementation.

Q20. Please provide a fleet inventory including fleet number, year, make, model, number of doors, service assignment, and relevant onboard equipment.

Fleet Inventory attached. MTA anticipates APCs will be required on vehicles designated for fixed-route service. The attached vehicle inventory identifies current anticipated APC requirements. Cutaway APC requirements are identified as TBD because MTA is evaluating future fixed-route and demand-response vehicle assignments. Vendors should identify unit pricing for APC equipment and installation so final quantities can be adjusted during implementation.

Q21. How many vehicles should vendors assume will require new or replacement hardware, and should spare equipment be included?

Vendors should assume that all vehicles identified in MTA’s vehicle inventory are within the scope of the project and should be appropriately equipped to support the proposed solution based on their intended service function. MTA is open to retaining and integrating existing onboard equipment where compatible and appropriate, including tablets/MDTs, Hanover destination signs, AngelTrax camera systems, and manufacturer-installed PA equipment.

Vendors should identify which existing equipment they propose to reuse or integrate and clearly identify and price any new, replacement, or supplemental hardware required to provide a complete solution.

Vendors should also include recommended quantities and pricing for spare equipment sufficient to support ongoing operations, maintenance, and timely replacement of failed equipment. Spare quantities should be clearly identified separately in the proposal.

Q22. Does MTA anticipate material fleet growth, new routes, service-area expansion, or other service changes during the contract term?

Proposers should design their solutions to accommodate reasonable fleet, route, user, ridership, and transaction growth during the contract term without replacement of the core platform.

5. Current Systems & Onboard Technology

Q23. What CAD/AVL, scheduling, reservations, demand-response, dispatch, MDT, APC, AVA, passenger-information, reporting, and related systems does MTA currently use, and which will be replaced, retained, or integrated?

MTA currently utilizes Ecolane for demand-response scheduling, reservations, dispatch, and associated GPS/AVL functionality, and UniteGPS for fixed-route GPS/AVL and related functions. Existing onboard equipment is further described in MTA's response regarding currently installed onboard technology.

The intent of this procurement is to replace MTA's existing core CAD/AVL, scheduling, demand-response, dispatch, passenger-information, reporting, and related software systems with the successful proposer's solution, as applicable to the scope of the RFP.

MTA is open to retaining and integrating existing onboard equipment where it is compatible with and appropriate for the proposed solution. This may include existing Samsung tablets/MDTs, Hanover exterior destination signs, AngelTrax camera systems, and manufacturer-installed PA equipment. However, MTA is also open to replacement or supplemental equipment where necessary or beneficial to provide a complete, reliable, and fully integrated solution.

MTA does not currently utilize APCs, automated voice annunciation, interior passenger-information displays, or fareboxes. Vendors should clearly identify which existing systems or equipment they propose to retain or integrate, which they propose to replace, and any additional hardware, software, interfaces, or third-party services required for their proposed solution.

Q24. What onboard technology is currently installed, including MDTs, APCs, automated voice annunciation/PA, interior displays, exterior destination signs, fareboxes, cameras, GPS, and communications equipment?

MTA's existing onboard technology varies by vehicle type and model year. Current equipment generally includes the following:

MDTs/Tablets: Samsung Galaxy Tab A9 (2025), Samsung Tab Active3, and Samsung Galaxy Tab A9+ 5G tablets operating on the Verizon cellular network.

APCs: MTA does not currently utilize automatic passenger counters.

Automated Voice Annunciation/PA: MTA does not currently utilize an automated voice annunciation system. Vehicles are equipped with the vehicle manufacturer's standard/base PA system. MTA is open to utilizing existing PA equipment where compatible with the proposed solution or to replacement/supplemental equipment where appropriate.

Interior Passenger Displays: MTA does not currently utilize interior passenger-information displays.

Exterior Destination Signs: MTA currently utilizes Hanover electronic destination signs. Specific models may vary by vehicle type and model year. Vendors should identify any compatibility requirements or additional equipment necessary for integration with their proposed solution.

Fareboxes: MTA does not currently utilize fareboxes and currently operates fare-free service.

Cameras: MTA vehicles are currently equipped with AngelTrax onboard camera systems. Specific configurations may vary by vehicle.

GPS/AVL: MTA currently utilizes UniteGPS for fixed-route GPS/AVL functionality and Ecolane for demand-response GPS/AVL functionality. These systems represent MTA's existing environment and are not intended to restrict vendors from proposing replacement technology as part of their proposed solution.

Communications: Onboard tablets currently utilize the Verizon cellular network.

Q25. May vendors reuse compatible existing or interoperable third-party onboard hardware?

Yes. Vendors may propose reuse of compatible existing equipment or interoperable third-party equipment where technically appropriate. Proposers are responsible for identifying compatibility requirements, limitations, integration costs, and any equipment they recommend replacing.

Q26. Is proprietary purpose-built MDT hardware required?

No. Vendors may propose purpose-built MDT hardware or commercially available ruggedized tablets/mobile devices provided with the proposed equipment satisfies all applicable functional, environmental, security, reliability, and support requirements.

Q27. Can MTA provide photographs of representative vehicle configurations and existing onboard equipment?

Yes. MTA will provide photographs showing representative examples of **all vehicle types in the fleet**, including photographs of the **existing onboard equipment and current equipment configurations**. Please see "MTA Vehicle Equipment Photo Appendix."

6. Communications & Connectivity

Q28. What cellular routers, carriers, SIM/APN services, Wi-Fi, and vehicle communications infrastructure does MTA currently use?

MTA currently utilizes tablets onboard its vehicles with Verizon providing cellular service. MTA does not currently utilize separate onboard cellular routers or vehicle Wi-Fi infrastructure.

Proposers should identify any additional cellular routers, SIM/APN services, communications equipment, or other onboard infrastructure required for their proposed solution and clearly identify associated equipment, installation, and recurring service costs.

Q29. Should MTA or the vendor provide and manage cellular routers, SIM cards, data plans, and recurring connectivity charges?

MTA currently provides and manages its cellular connectivity, including SIM cards, data plans, and associated recurring connectivity charges, and vendors should assume that MTA may continue to manage these services. However, MTA is open to vendor-provided or vendor-managed connectivity where required or recommended for the proposed solution. Vendors proposing vendor-managed connectivity should clearly identify the equipment, cellular carrier requirements, data plans, recurring charges, and any other associated costs in their proposal. Any specific requirements for cellular routers or other communications equipment should also be clearly identified.

Q30. Will offline/store-and-forward functionality be acceptable where continuous cellular coverage is unavailable?

Yes. Proposed solutions should provide appropriate offline and store-and-forward functionality to maintain essential operations during temporary losses of cellular connectivity.

Q31. Does Section 3.4 require replacement of MTA's two-way voice radio system, or is the requirement limited to data/text communications?

No, radio replacement is not in the scope, the requirement is limited to data/text communications.

7. Data Migration, Database & Reporting

Q32. What data is expected to be migrated, including customer/rider records, eligibility information, addresses, reservations, subscriptions, historical trips, schedules, AVL, ridership, fares, and reporting data?

Proposers should describe their approach and capabilities for migrating relevant operational data from MTA's existing systems. Final migration scope, available formats, historical period, record volumes, validation, and archive requirements will be established with the selected vendor during implementation.

Q33. Does MTA require a particular database technology?

No specific database technology is prescribed. MTA's priorities are functionality, security, interoperability, data ownership, appropriate APIs, and the ability to export MTA data in usable formats.

Q34. Must dashboards, ad-hoc reporting, APC validation, and NTD reporting capabilities be native to the core product?

Not necessarily. MTA will consider integrated third-party reporting or analytics components provided the overall solution satisfies the RFP's functional, reporting, data-access, security, and NTD requirements.

Q35. What existing or planned reporting systems must the APC solution integrate with?

MTA does not currently have a separate reporting system that the APC solution is specifically required to integrate with.

The proposed APC solution should provide robust reporting and data-export capabilities that allow MTA to utilize passenger-count data for operational analysis, service planning, ridership reporting, and applicable NTD reporting requirements.

The solution should also support open, documented, and standards-based methods for exporting or integrating APC data with other MTA systems or third-party reporting and analytics platforms, should such integrations be needed in the future.

Proposers should describe the reporting tools included with their APC solution, available data-export formats and APIs, and any capabilities for integrating APC data with other reporting or transit-management systems.

8. APIs, Integrations & SSO

Q36. What existing systems, APIs, formats, endpoints, and third-party interface fees should vendors assume for required integrations?

MTA does not currently have a comprehensive list of required existing system integrations, APIs, endpoints, or associated third-party interface fees that proposers should assume beyond those specifically identified in the RFP.

The intent of this procurement is to replace and modernize existing operational software and related systems; therefore, integration with existing systems that will be replaced is not necessarily required.

Proposers should identify any integrations necessary for their proposed solution, including required APIs, data formats, endpoints, third-party services, and associated one-time or recurring interface fees. The proposed solution should support commonly used and open industry standard interfaces and data formats where applicable.

Any required third-party integration or interface costs known to the proposer should be clearly identified in the proposal and pricing.

Q37. What API/interface standards will MTA accept?

GTFS and GTFS-Realtime functionality should comply with applicable industry standards. For other integrations, MTA will consider documented REST/JSON APIs, webhooks, secure file-based interfaces, or other appropriate standards-based methods.

Q38. What does MTA expect regarding future GIS, fare-payment, mobile-app, MaaS, regional transportation, rider-communication, and emerging-technology integrations?

MTA is seeking a flexible and scalable solution that can support future integrations as technology, regional partnerships, and agency needs evolve. MTA does not expect proposers to provide all potential future integrations as part of the base implementation unless specifically required elsewhere in the RFP.

The proposed system should support integration with third-party systems through industry-standard APIs, data formats, and other appropriate interoperability methods. Potential future integrations may include GIS and mapping platforms, fare-payment systems, passenger mobile applications, Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS) platforms, regional transportation partners, rider communication and notification systems, and other emerging transit technologies.

Proposers should describe their system's existing integration capabilities, available APIs, supported industry standards, known third-party integrations, and the process and potential costs associated with adding future integrations. Where applicable, proposers should also identify any integrations or functionality that are included in the base proposal versus available as optional or future enhancements.

Q39. What identity provider does MTA currently use, and are SAML 2.0/OpenID Connect acceptable for SSO?

MTA currently utilizes Okta and SAML 2.0/OpenID is acceptable for Okta SSO if proposers are compatible with it

9. Cloud, Cybersecurity, Data Residency & SLA

Q40. Is a commercial multi-tenant SaaS solution hosted in U.S.-based public-cloud regions acceptable?

A commercial SaaS architecture may be proposed provided it satisfies all RFP requirements for security, U.S. data residency, availability, data ownership, access, backup, disaster recovery, performance, and interoperability.

Q41. Are SOC 2 Type II or ISO 27001 certifications mandatory?

Proposers should identify applicable security certifications, independent assessments, penetration testing, and security controls and demonstrate how the proposed solution meets the cybersecurity requirements of the RFP.

Q42. May personnel outside the United States perform development or support if they cannot access MTA production data?

Yes. Personnel located outside the United States may perform development or support activities provided that such personnel do not access, view, receive, store, transmit, or process MTA production data, personally identifiable information, or other protected or confidential MTA data.

All MTA production data and applicable protected or confidential data must remain within the United States and may only be accessed and processed in accordance with the requirements of the RFP, resulting contract, and applicable federal and state requirements.

Any development or support performed outside the United States must utilize environments and data that do not provide access to MTA production data. The selected contractor remains responsible for ensuring that its employees, subcontractors, and other personnel comply with all applicable data security, confidentiality, access-control, and data-residency requirements.

Proposers should clearly identify any development or support activities that will be performed outside the United States and describe the technical and administrative controls used to prevent unauthorized access to MTA production data.

Q43. Does MTA have required RTO, RPO, support response/resolution times, or uptime thresholds beyond the stated 99.9% uptime preference?

MTA does not currently have established RTO, RPO, support response/resolution time, or uptime requirements beyond the 99.9% uptime preference stated in the RFP.

Proposers should describe their standard service-level commitments, including system uptime, RTO and RPO targets, backup and disaster-recovery practices, and support response and resolution times by issue severity. Proposers should also identify any differences in service levels between standard and optional/premium support offerings and any associated additional costs.

10. Passenger Information, Displays & Accessibility

Q44. Is a native MTA-branded iOS/Android passenger application mandatory, or may vendors propose a responsive web/PWA and/or third-party trip-planning applications using MTA GTFS/GTFS-Realtime data?

A native MTA-branded iOS/Android application is not mandatory. MTA will consider a variety of rider-facing solutions, including native mobile applications, responsive web applications, Progressive Web Applications (PWAs), and integration with established third-party trip-planning applications utilizing MTA's GTFS and GTFS-Realtime data.

MTA's priority is to provide riders with a reliable, intuitive, accessible, and easy-to-use way to access trip-planning, schedule, real-time vehicle information, service alerts, and other applicable passenger information. Proposed solutions should meet the functional, accessibility, data, and integration requirements of the RFP.

Proposers should clearly describe their recommended rider-facing solution, including any MTA branding capabilities, third-party dependencies, licensing or recurring costs, and how the solution will integrate with MTA's website and existing or proposed passenger-information systems.

Q45. Does MTA currently have an existing rider-facing application or web passenger-information platform?

MTA currently utilizes Ecolane for Demand Response services, which includes a rider-facing application. The application is not currently white-labeled or MTA-branded.

For fixed-route services, MTA currently utilizes UniteGPS, which provides a rider-facing web platform for real-time transit information.

MTA is open to solutions that replace, integrate with, or enhance these existing rider-facing tools, provided the proposed solution meets the functional, accessibility, integration, and passenger-information requirements identified in the RFP. Proposers should clearly describe their proposed rider-facing solution and identify any dependencies on existing or third-party platforms.

Q46. How many wayside passenger-information displays are in scope and at what locations?

MTA currently has one wayside passenger-information display located at the Transit Community Center. The existing display is integrated with MTA's GTFS data to provide passenger information.

MTA is not currently requiring the installation of additional wayside displays as part of this procurement. However, the proposed software solution should be capable of integrating with the existing display and supporting similar GTFS-based passenger-information displays that MTA may add in the future.

Proposers should describe their capabilities for supporting and integrating with existing and future wayside passenger-information displays, including any applicable interface, licensing, or integration requirements.

Q47. Are existing interior/exterior displays and destination signs to be retained/integrated or replaced, and what equipment is currently installed?

MTA currently utilizes Hanover electronic destination/headsigns across its applicable fleet. Specific sign models may vary by vehicle type and model year. MTA expects the proposed solution to support integration with the existing Hanover signs where feasible. Detailed equipment/model information can be provided during implementation as necessary. Vendors should identify any specific compatibility requirements, interfaces, or additional equipment required for their proposed solution.

Q48. What accessibility standard/conformance level applies to web and mobile passenger applications, and what evidence will MTA accept?

MTA expects all public-facing web and mobile passenger applications provided under this RFP to comply with applicable federal accessibility requirements and generally recognized accessibility standards, including WCAG 2.1 Level AA or higher, as applicable.

Vendors should describe the accessibility standards supported by their proposed solution and provide available documentation demonstrating conformance, such as a current VPAT/Accessibility Conformance Report (ACR), accessibility testing results, third-party accessibility assessment, or equivalent documentation. Vendors should also identify any known accessibility limitations and their approach and timeline for remediation.

11. APC / AVA / Vehicle Hardware

Q49. How will MTA verify the required minimum 95% APC accuracy?

Final acceptance may include field validation conducted in coordination with MTA. Independent certification or prior validation may be submitted as supporting evidence but does not eliminate MTA's right to conduct acceptance testing.

Q50. Which vehicles currently have APCs, what equipment is installed, and should proposers furnish APCs for vehicles without them?

MTA does not currently have Automatic Passenger Counters (APCs) installed on any vehicles in its fleet. Proposers should include any APC hardware, equipment, installation, and associated system components necessary to provide the APC functionality proposed in their solution.

Q51. What AVA/PA equipment is currently installed and should it be reused or replaced?

MTA does not currently utilize an automated voice annunciation (AVA) system. Vehicles are equipped with the vehicle manufacturer's standard/base PA system. MTA is open to utilizing the existing PA equipment where compatible with the proposed solution; however, vendors may propose replacement or supplemental equipment where necessary or beneficial to meet the requirements of the project. Any proposed replacement or supplemental equipment should be clearly identified and priced in the proposal.

12. Implementation, Acceptance & Training

Q52. Does MTA have a mandatory migration, cutover, launch, or production go-live date following award?

MTA has not established a mandatory production go-live date beyond the procurement schedule. Proposers should provide a realistic implementation schedule covering configuration, integration, hardware installation, data migration, testing, training, acceptance, and go-live.

Q53. Will MTA accept phased implementation and acceptance testing by phase?

Yes. MTA will consider a phased implementation where appropriate. Proposers should clearly identify proposed phases, dependencies, testing and acceptance criteria, and associated pricing.

Q54. When will vehicles be available for hardware installation?

Vehicle installation will be coordinated with MTA to minimize disruption to revenue service. Detailed installation schedules, vehicle availability, and installation windows will be established with the selected vendor during implementation.

For planning purposes, MTA operates a reduced service schedule on Saturdays and does not operate regular revenue service on Sundays. Accordingly, weekends may provide preferred installation opportunities, subject to vehicle availability and coordination with MTA staff. Other installation windows may also be coordinated as necessary to support the implementation schedule.

Q55. What acceptance/payment structure and training quantities should proposers assume, and is virtual/hybrid training acceptable?

MTA anticipates that acceptance and payment will be tied to mutually agreed-upon implementation milestones, which may include system configuration, equipment delivery

and installation, testing, training, system go-live, and final acceptance. The final milestone and payment schedule will be established with the selected vendor during contract negotiations.

For proposal and pricing purposes, proposers should assume training will be required for approximately 5 dispatch/scheduling staff, 6 administrative/supervisory staff, and 45 drivers. MTA is open to a train-the-trainer approach for driver training where appropriate.

Virtual or hybrid training is acceptable for portions of the implementation where it can be effectively delivered remotely. MTA may require in-person training for key system functions, implementation activities, or hands-on equipment training. Proposers should clearly identify their recommended training approach, including which training would be provided in person versus virtually.

13. Operating Volumes, Scalability & Dial-A-Ride

Q56. For system sizing and pricing, what are MTA's approximate numbers of dispatchers, schedulers, administrators, drivers, concurrent users, daily demand-response trips, annual fixed-route ridership, annual demand-response ridership, and anticipated rider-app users?

For system sizing and pricing purposes, MTA currently has approximately five (5) dispatcher/scheduler users, forty-five (45) drivers, and six (6) supervisor/administrative users.

In 2025, MTA provided approximately 520,670 fixed-route passenger trips and 54,782 Demand Response passenger trips. Based on MTA's operating days, this represents an average of approximately 1,707 fixed-route passenger trips and 180 Demand Response passenger trips per service day.

MTA does not currently have a reliable estimate of the number of unique riders who would utilize a new rider-facing application. For planning and system-sizing purposes, proposers should assume that rider-app adoption could represent a meaningful portion of MTA's ridership and should propose a solution capable of accommodating growth in user adoption without requiring significant system modifications or additional infrastructure.

MTA cannot provide a specific concurrent-user count at this time. Proposed solutions should be appropriately scalable to support MTA's current staffing and ridership levels as well as reasonable growth throughout the contract term.

Q57. What fleet, ridership, route, user, and transaction growth should vendors design for over the contract term?

The solution should be scalable to accommodate reasonable growth during the initial term and any exercised option periods without replacement of the core platform.

Q58. Does MTA have a target Dial-A-Ride productivity level or defined service zones that vendors should use for system design?

MTA does not currently have a specific Dial-A-Ride productivity target that proposers are required to use for system design or configuration.

For operational and scheduling purposes, MTA's Dial-A-Ride service is generally managed as two primary service areas: Shelton and Belfair/North Mason. Vehicles and trips are typically coordinated within these respective service areas; however, these are operational service areas rather than formal passenger eligibility or fare zones.

The proposed solution should provide flexibility to support MTA's current service-area structure while allowing staff to establish, modify, or manage geographic zones and service parameters as operational needs change.

Proposers should also describe the tools available within their solution for monitoring Dial-A-Ride productivity, including measures such as passenger trips per vehicle/revenue hour, and for managing geographic service areas or vehicle assignments.

Q59. Is paratransit eligibility management in scope? If so, provide eligible-user counts, application/recertification volumes, forms, correspondence, warning letters, and suspensions.

MTA does not require paratransit eligibility-management functionality. MTA's Dial-A-Ride service is available to the general public and does not require riders to complete an eligibility application or certification process. Therefore, eligibility application, recertification, and related eligibility-processing volumes are not applicable to this procurement.

MTA is, however, interested in functionality that supports customer correspondence and documentation related to service use, including the ability to create, issue, and track warning letters, suspensions, and other applicable customer communications. The system should allow staff to maintain an appropriate history of these actions and associated correspondence within the customer record.

Proposers should describe any functionality available within their proposed solution for managing and tracking customer warnings, suspensions, correspondence, and related documentation.

Q60. What are MTA's biggest concerns with the current software solution and what improvements are highest priority?

MTA's priorities and desired improvements are reflected in the scope, functional requirements, and evaluation criteria identified throughout the RFP. The purpose of this procurement is to evaluate available solutions that can improve operational efficiency,

system integration, reliability, data accessibility, staff workflows, and the overall rider experience.

MTA does not intend to identify additional requirements or evaluation priorities through this Q&A that are not otherwise reflected in the RFP. Proposers should use the requirements contained in the RFP and applicable addenda or clarifications as the basis for developing their proposed solution.

Proposers are encouraged to identify capabilities, efficiencies, or innovative approaches within their proposed solution that they believe would provide additional operational value to MTA.

Q61. What is the overall budget for the program?

MTA is not publishing an estimated project budget or independent cost estimate for this procurement. Proposers should submit their best competitive pricing based on the scope, requirements, and functionality identified in the RFP and subsequent addenda or clarifications.

Proposals should clearly identify all costs associated with the proposed solution, including implementation, hardware, software, licensing, subscriptions, integrations, training, support, maintenance, and any other applicable recurring or one-time costs.

14. Integrated Solution Architecture & Cross-Mode Operations

The following consolidated questions incorporate the additional vendor questions concerning integrated fixed-route and demand-response architecture. Overlapping questions have been combined to avoid repetitive responses.

Q62. What does MTA mean by an "integrated solution," and must fixed-route and demand-response functionality reside in a single software platform?

MTA is seeking an integrated operational environment and does not require every function to reside within a single software application or code base. A single-platform solution, a prime-contractor solution using specialized partners, or an integrated best-of-breed architecture may be proposed, provided the complete solution satisfies the functional, interoperability, security, support, data-access, and performance requirements of the RFP.

Q63. If multiple systems or vendors are proposed, what integration is required and how will those solutions be evaluated?

Multi-system solutions should operate as a cohesive solution rather than isolated applications. Proposers should clearly describe system boundaries, interfaces, data ownership, APIs/data exchanges, real-time or near-real-time information sharing, user workflows, responsibility for integration, support/escalation, and any third-party fees. Proposals will be evaluated against the RFP requirements and evaluation criteria rather than solely on whether the architecture is single-vendor or multi-vendor.

Q64. Must the prime contractor itself provide all components?

No. A prime contractor may propose specialized subcontractors or technology partners, subject to the subcontracting and responsibility requirements of the RFP. The prime proposer should clearly identify each party, its role, and responsibility for successful end-to-end integration and support.

Q65. Must fixed-route and demand-response scheduling and dispatch be performed within the same applications?

Not necessarily. Separate scheduling or dispatch applications may be proposed if the resulting solution satisfies MTA's operational requirements and provides appropriate integration, data exchange, visibility, and coordinated workflows between service modes.

Q66. Does MTA require a common dispatch environment or real-time coordination between fixed-route and demand-response operations?

MTA currently utilizes separate software platforms for fixed-route and demand-response operations. MTA does not require that both services operate within a single dispatch environment; however, improved integration and real-time coordination between fixed-route and demand-response operations is desirable.

Proposers should describe how their proposed solution supports coordination between the two service types, including any shared dispatch functionality, real-time vehicle visibility, data sharing, passenger transfer coordination, or other integration capabilities. Proposers should clearly identify whether these capabilities are included in the proposed solution or require additional modules, integrations, or costs.

Q67. What demand-response services are included in this procurement?

MTA operates a general public, open Dial-A-Ride demand-response service that is available to all riders and also serves as MTA's complementary ADA paratransit service. The demand-response functionality included in this procurement should support the scheduling, dispatching, and management of this service, including the requirements necessary to support MTA's ADA paratransit obligations.

Q68. What reservation and customer-booking capabilities are required for demand-response?

MTA requires the proposed demand-response solution to support multiple booking methods, including telephone bookings handled by MTA staff, web-based booking, mobile/self-service booking, recurring subscription trips, and same-day trip requests. The system should provide MTA staff with the ability to manage, modify, and monitor bookings regardless of the method through which the trip was requested.

Q69. What scheduling/optimization capabilities are required for demand-response, including dynamic optimization, batch scheduling, negotiated pickup windows, and automated vehicle/trip assignment?

MTA currently utilizes Ecolane for demand-response scheduling and dispatch and expects the proposed solution to provide comparable or enhanced scheduling and optimization capabilities.

The system should support dynamic and batch scheduling, negotiated pickup and/or drop-off windows, automated vehicle and trip assignment, and real-time optimization as schedules and operating conditions change throughout the service day. Dispatchers should retain the ability to manually review, modify, reassign, or override automated scheduling recommendations when operationally necessary.

Proposers should describe their scheduling and optimization methodology, including how the system accommodates same-day trips, subscription trips, cancellations, no-shows, vehicle capacity, passenger needs, travel-time considerations, and changes that occur during daily operations.

Q70. Must all fixed-route and demand-response vehicles use a common AVL platform and common vehicle-location dashboard?

MTA will consider either a common AVL platform or interoperable AVL components, provided the proposed architecture delivers the operational visibility, reporting, data access, and integration required by the RFP.

Q71. What AVL position-update frequency is required?

MTA does not currently have a required standard for AVL position-update frequency. Proposers should identify the standard position-update frequency provided by their proposed solution, including any differences between fixed-route and demand-response operations, if applicable.

The proposed frequency should be sufficient to support effective real-time vehicle tracking, dispatch operations, passenger information, and associated system functionality. Proposers should also identify whether more frequent position updates are available and whether they would result in additional equipment, cellular data, licensing, or other costs.

Q72. Must fixed-route and demand-response operators use the same MDT software and hardware?

No common hardware or software platform is required solely for uniformity, provided each proposed MDT environment satisfies the applicable RFP requirements and the overall solution remains supportable and appropriately integrated.

Q73. Are electronic manifests required for demand-response operators, and what passenger/trip functions must the MDT support?

MTA does not require a traditional electronic manifest; however, the proposed MDT/mobile solution must provide operators with an electronic, sequential workflow that guides them through their assigned pickups and drop-offs.

At a minimum, operators should be able to view relevant trip and passenger information, including customer-specific comments or instructions; record trip status information, including passenger no-shows; and add or account for additional passengers/companions at the time of pickup when appropriate. The system should update trip information and communicate relevant changes with dispatch in real time or near real time.

Proposers should describe any additional MDT functionality available to support demand-response operators and dispatch coordination.

Q74. Is integrated turn-by-turn navigation required for demand-response, and may third-party navigation applications be used?

Third-party navigation may be proposed if appropriately integrated into the operator workflow and if the overall solution meets MTA's safety, usability, security, support, and functional requirements.

Q75. Must dispatcher-to-operator messaging use one common environment across both service modes?

MTA does not require dispatcher-to-operator messaging to operate through a single common environment across fixed-route and Demand Response services. Separate messaging environments are acceptable, provided they are appropriately integrated with the proposed solution and support reliable and efficient communication between dispatchers and operators.

Proposers should describe their proposed messaging approach, including how messaging is integrated into dispatcher and operator workflows and how messages are managed, tracked, and retained, as applicable.

Q76. Does MTA require one reporting environment or consolidated data warehouse for fixed-route and demand-response?

MTA does not require every report to originate from a single application. Reporting may be generated from multiple integrated systems or a common analytics/reporting layer, provided MTA can obtain the required operational, management, and regulatory reporting with appropriate data access and consistency.

Q77. Does MTA require combined NTD reporting and cross-mode KPI/executive dashboards?

MTA requires the proposed solution to support the collection and reporting of data necessary for applicable National Transit Database (NTD) reporting requirements. Where the proposed solution supports both fixed-route and demand-response operations, the ability to consolidate data and reporting across service modes is desirable.

Cross-mode KPI and executive dashboards are also desirable but are not required to be provided within a single dashboard. Proposers should describe available reporting and

dashboard capabilities, including NTD reporting, ridership, on-time performance, productivity, service performance, vehicle utilization, and other operational KPIs.

Proposers should clearly identify which reporting and dashboard capabilities are included in the base solution and which, if any, require additional modules, integration, or costs.

Q78. Must riders use a single account, mobile application, or trip-planning experience for both fixed-route and demand-response?

MTA does not require fixed-route and demand-response services to be provided through a single rider account, mobile application, or trip-planning platform. However, a unified or integrated rider experience that allows customers to access information and services for both fixed-route and demand-response transportation through a single application or interface would be beneficial and is desirable.

Proposers should describe how their solution supports integration between the two service modes, including any unified account, trip-planning, booking, real-time information, or other cross-mode functionality. Proposers should identify whether these capabilities are included in the base solution or require additional modules, integrations, or costs.

Q79. Should demand-response vehicles appear in the same public real-time passenger-information environment as fixed-route vehicles?

No. MTA does not want demand-response vehicles displayed in the same public real-time passenger-information environment as fixed-route vehicles or otherwise made visible to the general public.

However, MTA desires customer-specific real-time trip information for demand-response riders. This may include notifications when the assigned vehicle is on the way or approaching, estimated arrival information, and/or the ability for an authenticated customer to track the vehicle associated with their individual trip.

Any demand-response vehicle location or trip information made available to riders should be limited to the appropriate customer and should not expose demand-response vehicle locations, passenger information, or trip activity to the general public.

Proposers should describe the customer notification and/or trip-tracking capabilities available within their proposed solution.

Q80. Must customer notifications, alerts, and trip communications be managed through one platform?

MTA will consider either a common communications platform or integrated component solutions, provided required communications are reliable, appropriately coordinated, accessible, and supported.

Q81. What open APIs and data exchanges are required between solution components?

Proposed solutions should support documented, standards-based interfaces sufficient to integrate required components and provide MTA appropriate access to its operational data. Proposers should describe available APIs for vehicle location, trip/schedule data, driver/vehicle status, reporting, and other applicable operational information, including authentication, rate limits, data formats, and any licensing costs.

Q82. Does MTA prescribe a preferred integration architecture or standards?

MTA does not prescribe a single integration architecture. Proposers should favor open, documented, secure, standards-based interfaces and clearly explain how their architecture avoids unnecessary vendor lock-in and supports future integrations.

Q83. What cybersecurity, authentication, and data-sharing requirements apply to integrated solutions?

All integrated components and interfaces must comply with the cybersecurity, authentication, access-control, data-residency, privacy, and other security requirements applicable under the RFP and resulting contract. Proposers should explain how security responsibilities are managed across all proposed vendors/components.

Q84. What long-term solution architecture is MTA seeking: single platform, best-of-breed integrated systems, or any compliant architecture?

MTA is primarily focused on the functionality, interoperability, reliability, usability, data access, supportability, security, and lifecycle value of the complete solution. Proposers may recommend the architecture they believe best satisfies the RFP and should clearly explain its advantages, dependencies, and integration approach.

Q85. Should proposers plan for future service expansion, microtransit/on-demand service, regional integration, or customer-facing mobility initiatives?

The proposed architecture should be scalable and capable of supporting reasonable future service expansion and additional integrations during the contract term. References to future capabilities do not, by themselves, establish a commitment by MTA to implement a specific new mode, vendor, or initiative.

Q86. Is there any mandatory requirement that prevents fixed-route ITS and demand-response functionality from being supplied by separate integrated systems?

No such architectural prohibition should be inferred unless expressly stated in the RFP. Separate integrated systems may be proposed if the complete solution satisfies all applicable functional, integration, data, security, support, and performance requirements.

15. Additional Final Vendor Questions – Consolidated

The following questions consolidate additional requests from the final vendor question list that were not already fully addressed above. Duplicate fleet, APC/AVA, data migration, implementation, integration, and passenger-information requests are incorporated into the existing consolidated questions rather than repeated.

Q87. How many non-revenue vehicles, such as supervisor, maintenance, or administrative vehicles, should be equipped with AVL and/or MDT equipment?

MTA does not require AVL and/or MDT equipment to be installed in any non-revenue supervisor, maintenance, or administrative vehicles as part of this procurement. Proposers should base their equipment quantities on the revenue vehicles identified in the vehicle list provided with MTA's responses to proposer questions.

Q88. For APC installation, how many passenger doors per vehicle require sensor coverage, and do requirements vary by vehicle type?

MTA operates two primary vehicle types with different APC sensor coverage requirements. 35-foot coaches will require APC sensor coverage at two passenger doors, the front and rear doors. Cutaway vehicles will require APC sensor coverage at one passenger door—the front door only.

Q89. How many interior passenger-information displays are expected per vehicle, and does the quantity vary by vehicle type or length?

MTA does not currently require interior passenger-information displays to be installed on revenue vehicles. MTA's existing passenger-information displays are located at transit facilities rather than onboard vehicles.

MTA is open to considering onboard passenger-information displays as an optional enhancement, particularly for coaches or other vehicles regularly assigned to fixed-route service. Vendors may describe available onboard display options, recommended configurations, integration with automated voice annunciation and other passenger-information functionality, and associated costs.

Onboard passenger-information displays should not be assumed to be a mandatory requirement or included as required base equipment unless otherwise necessary for the vendor's proposed solution. Any optional equipment and associated pricing should be clearly identified separately.

Q90. How many bus stops, transit centers, and park-and-ride locations are in the MTA system, and is a current stop/location inventory available?

MTA will provide a current inventory of bus stops, transit centers, and park-and-ride locations within the MTA system, including the applicable location information for each. Please see "MTA Bus Stop and Facility Inventory"

Q91. What route-deviation management capabilities is MTA seeking?

Proposers should describe tools available to manage planned and unplanned route deviations, including the ability to communicate changes to dispatchers, operators, and passenger-information systems; maintain accurate service information; and document operational impacts.

Q92. How often does MTA perform run cutting, and how is run cutting accomplished today?

MTA currently performs run cutting approximately three times per year. The process is completed manually, primarily using spreadsheets and, in some cases, physical route cards that are organized and combined to develop operator assignments and work.

As part of this procurement, MTA is seeking a more efficient, electronic approach to run cutting that reduces manual processes and provides staff with improved tools to create, modify, organize, and evaluate runs and operator assignments.

Proposers should describe the run-cutting functionality available within their proposed solution, including capabilities for developing and modifying runs, identifying scheduling conflicts or inefficiencies, and supporting the development of efficient operator assignments.

Q93. What does MTA expect from reservation management functionality?

MTA expects the reservation management functionality to support its Demand Response operations and provide staff with efficient tools to create, modify, cancel, search, and manage passenger trips.

The system must support same-day trip booking, recurring and subscription trips, and web/mobile self-service functionality that allows riders to manage applicable trip activities. Reservation management should also include functionality for tracking trip status and history, cancellations, no-shows, and other relevant trip activity.

The proposed solution should provide staff with clear visibility into scheduled and completed trips and allow appropriate trip and customer information to be readily accessed by scheduling and dispatch personnel.

Proposers should describe their reservation management and rider self-service capabilities, including the functionality available through web and mobile interfaces and any additional features that may improve scheduling, dispatch, trip management, or the rider experience.

Q94. How does MTA measure route productivity, and what ridership analytics are expected?

MTA is seeking reporting and analytics that allow staff to evaluate service performance using available operational and ridership data, including measures such as ridership, passenger activity by route/trip/stop, service hours and miles, and productivity measures such as passengers per revenue hour where supported by the underlying data.

Q95. What does MTA mean by dashboard functionality in Section 3.10?

MTA is seeking user-friendly dashboards that provide timely visibility into key operational and performance information relevant to the user's role. Proposers should describe configurable dashboards, available KPIs, filtering and drill-down capabilities, alerts/exceptions, and the ability to export or further analyze underlying data.

Q96. May proposers submit an itemized pricing detail in addition to the required Cost Proposal/Pricing Form?

Yes. Proposers may provide supplemental itemized pricing to clarify their cost proposal, provided the required MTA Pricing Form is completed and submitted and the supplemental information does not conflict with the pricing stated on the required form.

Q97. Should optional rider-communication capabilities such as IVR notifications, AI/automated call-center functionality, inbound/outbound SMS, and similar tools be included in pricing?

Proposers may identify optional rider-communication capabilities and associated pricing separately from the required core proposal unless a capability is expressly required by the RFP. Optional pricing should clearly identify implementation costs, recurring fees, usage-based charges, third-party charges, and any dependencies.

Q98. What are MTA's expectations for Workforce Management?

Workforce Management should support efficient management of transit operations personnel as applicable to the proposed solution, including operator assignments, availability, work status, and coordination with scheduling/dispatch functions. Proposers should describe the workforce-management functionality included in their solution and any optional capabilities.

Q99. Is optional pricing for telematics, camera, or fleet-management functionality desired, and what existing systems are currently in use?

MTA is not requesting optional pricing for telematics, camera systems, or additional fleet-management functionality as part of this procurement. These services are outside the current scope of the RFP and should not be included in the proposed solution or pricing.

Proposers should focus their proposals and pricing on the systems, functionality, and services specifically identified within the RFP.

Q100. What are the primary success factors or KPIs MTA will use to determine project success?

Project success will be based on the selected solution meeting the RFP requirements and accepted implementation commitments, including reliable system performance, successful integration and data migration, effective training and user adoption, accurate and accessible operational information, and improved support for MTA's operational workflows.

Q101. Who will evaluate proposals, and will MTA identify individual evaluators or their titles/departments?

MTA will evaluate proposals in accordance with the evaluation process and criteria established in the RFP. MTA is not required to identify individual evaluation committee members in advance of the evaluation process.

Q102. Would MTA consider a pilot or side-by-side evaluation of finalist solutions before final selection?

MTA will follow the evaluation process described in the RFP, including any demonstrations, interviews, clarifications, or other evaluation activities MTA determines are appropriate and permitted by the solicitation. Proposers should not assume that a separate pilot program will be conducted unless MTA requests one.

Q103. If a requirement is satisfied through a named third-party product or integration rather than native functionality, will it receive the same functional evaluation consideration?

MTA will evaluate whether the proposed complete solution satisfies the applicable functional and performance requirements, regardless of whether a capability is native or provided through an integrated third-party product. Proposers must clearly identify third-party dependencies, integration responsibilities, licensing or recurring fees, support arrangements, and any limitations.

Q104. Which fees should be included in core pricing, including intermodal/multimodal, AI/IVR, ticketing, mapping, real-time traffic/speed data, SMS/messaging, and other third-party or usage-based fees?

Core pricing should include all costs necessary to provide the proposer's proposed solution and satisfy the requirements for the components being offered. Any optional, usage-based, third-party, or pass-through fees should be clearly identified, with the pricing basis and assumptions stated. Proposers should not omit known required costs that would be necessary for MTA to operate the proposed solution.