

May 27, 2020

ADDENDUM NUMBER ONE

ATL RFQ Number 20-010 REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Atlanta-Region Transit Link Authority (ATL)
ISSUED BY: State Road and Tollway Authority (SRTA)
245 Peachtree Center Avenue, Suite 2200
Atlanta, GA 30303

From: Richard Sawyer, Issuing Officer
To: Potential Respondents

This Addendum forms a part of the **Request for Qualifications (RFQ) No. 20-010** and modifies the RFQ as described below. ATL changes and clarifications are underlined. This Addendum consists of **Eleven-(11) pages**.

1. ATL CHANGE TO RFI SCHEDULE OF EVENTS – DEADLINE EXTENSION

*SATL is hereby issuing a **NEW SECTION 1.3 RFQ Solicitation Schedule** for this RFQ. Potential respondents must respond as prescribed by the RFQ, and by the new times and dates, which are highlighted and underlined, below:*

RFQ Issue date	May 14, 2020
Deadline for submitting questions	May 22, 2020 (2:00 PM)
SRTA posts official answers	May 27, 2020
<u>SOQ Submittal Deadline</u>	<u>June 12, 2020 (2:00 PM)</u>
<u>Abbreviated System Demonstrations (potential)</u>	<u>June 23rd – 25th, 2020 TBD</u>
<u>Notice of Shortlisted Firms (anticipated)</u>	<u>July 7, 2020 TBD</u>

2. ATL ANSWERS TO POTENTIAL RESPONDENT'S QUESTIONS

ATL is hereby issuing responses to questions received from potential respondents to the RFQ. Answers, along with an Exhibit A with additional information, is provided below. Official answers are underlined.

**QUESTIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO
ATL RFQ Number 20-010
ATL Enterprise Asset Management System**

(Questions for RFQ Number 20-010, submitted by the question submittal deadline).

- 1) Pricing Type – Please provide the anticipated type of contract desired (Fixed, T&M with a NTE, Etc.) **(RESPONSE #1): [ATL may provide additional information relevant to this question/requested information in the prospective RFP phase, and/or it may be determined in the RFP process. The information requested is not critical for interested firms to provide Statements of Qualifications responsive to this RFQ].**
- 2) Type and Term of Contract – Please provide the anticipated Term of the Contract. **Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently intends and anticipates the initial term of a resulting Agreement will be five years, with multiple one-year renewals possible.**
- 3) Being that pricing is not discussed in the RFQ, can it be assumed that the pricing part of the process will be at some point AFTER vendors are shortlisted? **Yes.**
- 4) Is there an anticipated schedule for entities to migrate to the solution? **Response #1 applies. The ATL currently envisions a required “go-live” date to be no later than 12 to 15 months from a Notice to Proceed (NTP).**
- 5) Please validate that you are desiring a SaaS EAM solution (i.e. subscription based). **Response #1 applies. The ATL currently envisions a subscription-based solution, but anticipates evaluating all responsive proposals in an RFP phase, including those proposing hosted solutions.**
- 6) Can you please provide the number of system users anticipated for each participating entity? **Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently envisions the required system shall be capable of supporting up to 286 initial users (ATL-3, ARC-3, SRTA-200, Cobb-80) including up to 150 concurrent users across all system functions, with additional Regional Partners possibly added in the future.**
- 7) Can you please provide the number of mobile users anticipated for each participating entity? **Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently anticipates the following required users, as a minimum: ATL- 100, Cobb-40.**
- 8) How many environments are desired and their purpose? **Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently envisions the required system shall allow at a minimum for configuration across three environments: development, test, and production.**

- 9) What are the security requirements for this project? Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently envisions requiring Proposers to, at a minimum, describe architecture and options for managing security and encryption of information for user access using a browser, data uploads of flat files and data transfers over the cloud/internet.
- 10) What are the number of integrations desired? Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently anticipates several integrations with existing or planned systems will be implemented as part of the EAMS project.
- 11) Are the integration points accessible via the internet (required for a SaaS system to access)? Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently expects that a prospective successful solution will provide APIs to manage integrations. Certain SRTA integrations may be manual initially until future business process changes. It is expected all integrations will run monthly at a minimum.
- 12) What address should the SOQ be mailed to? Section 2.3 references Section 1.5 but 1.5 is Mr. Sawyer's email address not a physical mailing location. The physical delivery address for SOQ submittals is:
Richard Sawyer, ATL RFQ No. 20-010 Issuing Officer
State Road and Tollway Authority Atlanta-Region Transit Link Authority (ATL), 245 Peachtree Center Avenue, Suite 2200, Atlanta, GA 30303.
- 13) What existing storage vendor(s) do you have in house? ATL and SRTA currently have no storage vendors.
- 14) Would you be open to learning more about other storage vendors if they meet or exceed your needs (cost and expectation wise)? Yes.
- 15) When it comes to storage solutions do you have any requirements when it comes to; capacity, performance? If so, what are the requirements? Response #1 applies.
- 16) In regard to storage, do you require any advanced functionalities such as; dedupe, compression, encryption, mirroring, replication, data tiering and virtualization? Response #1 applies.
- 17) What current backup tools are you using? Response #1 applies.
- 18) Do you require additional information on remote backup and recovery? Response #1 applies, however if remote backup and recovery is a capability of respondents to this RFQ, information should be appropriately provided where prescribed in the RFQ Section 3.7.
- 19) Do you have a current or future need to integrate cloud as a storage tier? Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently envisions requiring cloud accessibility.

- 20) What is the forecasted growth of the storage environment over the next 18 months? 3 Years? Response #1 applies, however the ATL currently envisions requiring small to medium growth.
- 21) Is the majority of your storage block or file? Response #1 applies.
- 22) Are there any specific Business Partners you work with? Response #1 applies.
- 23) DBE requirement of 9.62%, if prime is DBE certified does that count towards goal? Response #1 applies. The ATL "agency-wide DBE goal" is 9.62%. Vendors/Proponents that are approved certified DBE's in the State of Georgia are eligible to participate as DBE's in the solicitation, which may count toward the agency-wide goal.
- 24) 2.11. Minority Business Participation Can DBE's be members of more than one Prime team? Response #1 applies. Vendors/Proponents that are approved certified DBE's in the State of Georgia are eligible to participate as DBE's in the solicitation. ATL is not involved in any teaming decisions of any firms.
- 25) 2.11. Minority Business Participation Can DBE submit as a prime and be subcontractor on another Prime's response as well? Response #1 applies. Vendors/Proponents that are approved certified DBE's in the State of Georgia are eligible to participate as DBE's in the solicitation. ATL is not involved in any teaming decisions of any firms.
- 26) 5.ENVISIONED SCOPE OF SERVICES System Integrations. Known systems that EAMS will be integrated with or share information? Response #1 applies, however some information regarding this and related inquiries may be found in "Exhibit A, INFORMATIONAL TABLES", (an exhibit to this Addendum document, below).
- 27) 5.ENVISIONED SCOPE OF SERVICES Reports and Dashboards Are users computer savvy for creation of reports from a database? Response #1 applies, however any resulting system should have available dashboard technology, and should be user-friendly and intuitive enough for users with a variety of computer skill levels.
- 28) 5.ENVISIONED SCOPE OF SERVICES Assets and EAMS Functionality Required by Regional Partner Tables. What type of assets are included/categorized as Infrastructure? Response #1 applies, however this is meant to include computers, laptops, servers, phones, tablets, cameras, and possibly tolling management assets installed at various locations.
- 29) 5.ENVISIONED SCOPE OF SERVICES Assets and EAMS Functionality Required by Regional Partner Tables Are any of the managed Infrastructure assets linear in nature such as roads, bridges/aerial structures, fiber, cabling, etc. Response #1 applies, however ATL/SRTA does not manage roads/bridges and similar assets

- 30) SCHEDULES OF EVENTS Due to the requirement for printed copies and the May 27 release of Q&A, would it be possible to have a 5-business day extension (6/12) for submittal? ATL will extend the deadline by Addendum, which these responses shall be a part of.
- 31) GENERAL QUESTION Can partners, if short listed, be added to the team? Response #1 applies, since a short list would only happen at the end of this RFQ process.
- 32) General - What percentage of the funding for this project is from US Federal sources? Response #1 applies, depending upon the finalized scope in subsequent phase.
- 33) Ref: 2.11 - Please confirm the DBE goal for this project is 9.62%. At this time, a DBE "project goal" has not been established. Section 2.11 of the RFQ states the ATL "agency-wide DBE goal" of 9.62% for federally funded contracts. Vendors/Proponents that are approved certified DBE's in the State of Georgia are eligible to participate as DBE's in the solicitation.
- 34) General - Due to current health & safety conditions would you consider both off-shore and remote resources. Response #1 applies. The ATL anticipates evaluating all responsive proposals in an RFP phase, including proposals with those resource types mentioned, and anticipates carefully considering the merits, advantages/disadvantages of all proposed resource types.
- 35) General - For on-site project resources will periodic Covid-19 Testing be required, and if so what is the estimated frequency (e.g. Weekly, Semi-Weekly)? Response #1 applies. Currently, such testing requirements are not planned, however certain protocols may be required.
- 36) Do you use outside contractors for maintenance? Response #1 applies.
- 37) What are your current asset management solutions? ATL/SRTA does not currently own or use an AM solution. ATL is aware service contractors have used, and/or use, RTA and Infor.
- 38) Will you be tracking asset locations in real time? Response #1 applies, however it is anticipated for revenue vehicles only, on current CAD/AVL system.
- 39) Do you have a need for a 311 customer service portal? Response #1 applies. However, ATL does not currently have such a need.
- 40) Please provide a listing of anticipated systems to be integrated with the EAMS solutions (GIS, ERP, Fueling, etc...). Response #1 applies, however it is anticipated for, but may not be limited to, CAD/AVL, GIS, and Fueling.
- 41) Please advise if ATL anticipates using VMRS Codes or Fuel Management functionalities within the EAMS solution. Yes, ATL does anticipate such utilization.

- 42) Will SRTA consider electronic submission in light of the fact that courier service may be erratic due to COVID19? The RFQ delivery instructions still apply to submission.
- 43) Will SRTA accept client references from the proposing team which comprise of System integrator and product vendor? Yes, to the extent responsive to relevancy requirements of the RFQ.
- 44) Are resumes part of the 12-page count? Respondents may provide such resumes with Offer Document #7, and shall not count as part of the 12 limited pages.
- 45) In the case of a firm with Prime and sub-contractors, are forms required for Prime only or both Prime and Sub? The forms are for respondent firms to the RFQ. Information for known subcontractors may be provided with or within the forms, to the extent the information is relevant and responsive to the RFQ. Such information is subject to the page restriction(s).
- 46) Will SRTA relax its requirement on the Notarized form for Contractor E-Verify Affidavit and accept an electronically signed version due to parts of the country that has stricter shelter-in-place rules? Or may we provide the notarized version, at a later date or at time of shortlisting? The current requirements of the RFQ as to Notarization shall remain in effect.
- 47) Would it be acceptable to include a cover letter not exceeding 2 pages with the response? Yes. ATL will allow this, outside of current page restrictions.
- 48) If a cover letter may be submitted, would it be exempt from all page limits shown in the RFQ? Yes.
- 49) Section 1.1 Purpose of Procurement: How will ATL distinguish between current scope and future scope as part of the current procurement process, or must respondents determine future scope needs without input on future envisioned RFP project phases? Response #1 applies.
- 50) Aside from ATL Authority, Cobb Community Transit, SRTA, MARTA and Gwinnett County, who are the "other transit operators within the ATL's jurisdiction" referenced in this section? Response #1 applies. Other Transit operators may include other smaller city/county services within the ATL's prevailing jurisdiction.
- 51) Section 2.4 Questions and 2.6 Amendments: Both sections mention that answers to questions and addenda will be posted on the Georgia Procurement Registry and at <https://atltransit.ga.gov/doing-business-with-atl/>. However, the current SOQ 20-010 is not included at ATL's site. It is ATL intent that questions/answers and amendments will be posted at the sites and on the dates indicated, subject to any limitations of or problems with the sites or posting methodologies, which the ATL will endeavor to mitigate.

- 52) What is the procedure to address the Issuing Officer after the questions answered date if we do not see responses to all our questions on the website? E-mails to the Issuing Officer are appropriate for such concerns.
- 53) What if we miss addenda because ATL failed to post to its websites? See applicable responses to questions #51 and #52.
- 54) The EAMS solicitation 19-011 from April 2019 is included on the ATL Procurement page, and it appears Advoco, 21Tech, ITS, DTS, and Trapeze Group were shortlisted and the RFP was later cancelled without award. What was the reason that ATL did not award a contract? (Were their weaknesses too great for procurement to accept all offerings, or did the budget not materialize?). Response #1 applies. While ATL reserves the right to cancel procurements for reasons it deems appropriate, such procurements, including this RFQ and a prospective RFP subsequent to this RFQ, are earnest processes. Nothing should be gleaned about any previous participant respondents or potential respondents to such processes from infrequent cancellations and/or process changes.
- 55) Section 2.2 Format of SOQ Submission: Due to the business and office closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic, would it be acceptable to submit e-mailed responses to ATL instead of the 6 hard copies and USB thumb drive? If not, can you confirm the SOQ documents should be mailed to "Atlanta-Region Transit Link Authority (ATL) 245 Peachtree Center Avenue, Suite 2200 Atlanta, GA 30303" with the phrasing included in Section 2.3 on the envelope? The instructions of the RFQ shall remain effective. Please see answer to question #12 and #55.
- 56) Section 2.9.w: The wording here seems to imply that at any time during our contract performance, a GA state agency could simply take over our work in flight for any reason whatsoever (or no reason). Is that the case, and if so, why would such an event occur? If there are caveats to this, they should be appended to 2.9.w. The referenced section is simply a statement that the ATL and similar State entities may sometimes choose to perform all or portions of scopes "in-house" rather than outsourcing. It is currently the intent to outsource the prospective scope which may result from this RFQ and subsequent RFP. A resulting contract, not this RFQ, would dictate any caveats (conditions) to the relationship of the outsourced service firm to the ATL/State.
- 57) Section 2.11 Minority Business Participation: Is the 9.62% DBE goal a hard requirement of this SOQ? Response #1 applies. At this time, a DBE "project goal" has not been established. Section 2.11 of the RFQ states the ATL "agency-wide DBE goal" of 9.62% for federally funded contracts.
- 58) This proposal did not include any contractual T&Cs. Will these be provided at this stage of the process or are these intended to be included in the second phase of the bid process? Response #1 applies. ATL intends to provide such information in an RFP process.
- 59) Section 2.17 Conditions SOQs states, "Terms and conditions attached to a proposal by a Proposer and made a condition of Contract execution may render the proposal non-

responsive and may be rejected by the ATL" Can you confirm that this means respondents are not allowed to attach any terms and conditions whatsoever to its SOQ (/RFP) response? Respondents should provide only what is required and/or requested in the RFQ, including Section 3 of the RFQ, this Addendum, and any subsequent Addenda.

- 60) If we include a cover page and a Table of Contents within Offer Documents 6 & 7, does that count towards the page limits? ATL will allow such inclusions to be outside the stated page restrictions.
- 61) Can/should the references in Offer Document #7, Section A1 be the same as those included in Offer Document #4? The references listed should be responsive to the corresponding RFQ, section, whether they are repeated in responses to other sections. It is the decision of the Respondent as to references they wish to provide.
- 62) Section 4.2.2 Evaluation by Qualifications Evaluation Committee: In addition to being posted on the ATL website, will the "Notice of Qualified Firms" on the shortlist be directly contacted and invited to participate in Phase 2 of the solicitation process? Yes, ATL will endeavor to directly notify invited firms.
- 63) Has ATL allocated a 2020/21 budget for this project? Response #1 applies.
- 64) Does ATL and each other entity in scope of this RFQ have collective bargaining agreements in place with staff involved in the project? No.
- 65) In RFQ section "3.7. Firm's Qualifications and Experience", proposers/submitters are asked to provide "letters of reference from at least (2) of those clients for whose projects were of similar scope should be provided if available." For RFQ proposals that include multiple firms on one team, is each firm required to submit 2 letters of reference, respectively (e.g., 2 firms = 4 total letters of reference for the team)? It is the ATL's desire to get adequate references on the Respondent entity. If that entity constitutes more than one prime submitting firm, please provide the additional references which would be required to be adequate for each prime submitting firm.
- 66) In RFQ "Section 2.3. Delivery of SOQs", it is stated SOQs must be delivered to the address noted in Section 1.5; however, Section 1.5 does not include a delivery address. Please clarify. Also, is The ATL willing to allow electronic submission as an alternative to physical delivery of proposals? Please see answers to Question #12 and #55.
- 67) Are bidders (whether a prime or subconsultant) required to be registered under National Institute of Government Purchasing (NIGP) commodity codes 95800 – Management and Operation Services and/or 99049 – Asset and Inventory Management Services? No.
- 68) The following Offer Documents appear mis-numbered according to the Offer Document 1 Statement of Qualifications Checklist. Can this be clarified?
- Certification Regarding Debarment and Suspension
 - Certification Regarding Lobbying ATL Solicitation No. 20-010

This is a technicality. Respondents should consider the Offer Document numbers as they appear on the individual forms, and any submittal checklist discrepancies on this particular technicality will be understood and allowed.

- 69) If the evaluation committee chooses to invite firms for a demo of their software, is the committee open to accommodating a virtual demo via online meeting? *ATL envisions this will be possible, depending on submittals and the evaluation of them, but anticipates an actual on-site demonstration in any subsequent steps.*
- 70) While The ATL has an agency-wide DBE goal of 9.62% across all federally funded contracts, there is no specific DBE goal percentage explicitly stated for this RFQ. Does The ATL intend to require a DBE goal for this procurement in either or both the RFQ and RFP stages? *Response #1 applies. At this time, a DBE "project goal" has not been established. Section 2.11 of the RFQ states the ATL "agency-wide DBE goal" of 9.62% for federally funded contracts.*
- 71) Are DBE firms required to be identified by name as part of a team's RFQ response/submission, or can this be delayed until the RFP proposal stage? *Respondents should follow the exact submittal requirements of the RFQ.*
- 72) By signing Offer "Document #2 – Statement of Qualification Letter", proposing firms are considered as agreeing to all provisions of the contract. However, since a contract has not been provided in the procurement documents at this stage, would The ATL be amenable to providing a sample contract? And if yes, is The ATL open to extending the proposal due date by 2 weeks to allow proposers to review the sample contract? *By signing, firms are only considered agreeing to any terms and conditions which has been provided by. ATL intends to provide terms and conditions information in an RFP phase.*
- 73) What is the anticipated contract duration of this project? *Response #1 applies, as well as the response to Question #2.*

EXHIBIT A INFORMATIONAL TABLES

The information assembled herein is intended as a response to some of the questions received from potential respondents, and is intended only to provide a frame of reference for respondents which ATL are requesting qualifications from. ATL's prospective RFP shall contain the actual environmental and scope information with which eventual proposers should rely on for submitting any actual proposals.

SRTA

Functions	Current System	Integration Type
Transit Asset Inventory - asset addition (purchase order) and disposal with details	PeopleSoft	Manual Excel import or ODBC to EAMS through Proposer provided tool or functionality.
Depreciation	PeopleSoft	Manual Excel export or ODBC from EAMS through Proposer provided tool or functionality.
Employee Data	PeopleSoft RTA Infor	Manual Excel import or ODBC to EAMS through Proposer provided tool or functionality.
Requisitions	PeopleSoft RTA Infor	No integration necessary, all requisitions created in EAMS will be manually created in PeopleSoft.
Tolling Asset Data	ETCC - HEAT Neology - Hardcat	Manual Excel import or ODBC to EAMS through Proposer provided tool or functionality.
Transit Asset, Work Order, and Parts Data	First Transit – Infor TransDev – Ron Turley Associates	Manual Excel imports initially and then future APIs. One-way.
Transit Asset Incident	Customer Service Center (CSS) Kapsch	Manual Excel import to EAMS through Proposer provided tool or functionality.
Asset Analysis and Reporting	TERM Lite	Manual Excel export to TERM Lite through Proposer provided tool or functionality.
Asset Location (GIS)	ArcGIS	API. One-way.
Transit Asset Incident (rolling stock); APC/CAD/AVL	Clever Devices	API. One-way.

IT Asset Data	Gigatrak	API. One-way.
Transit Maintenance Management (fuel, fluids and mileage)	FuelMaster, with fluid management app TBD	API. One-way.
Reporting and Analysis	Tableau	API using OLE. One-way.

CobbLinc

Functions	Current System	Integration Type
Transit Asset Inventory - Asset Inventory, Work Orders/Request and cost	Infor EAM	API or automated equivalent. One-way.
Facilities Management	Corrigo SaaS- CMMS	API or automated equivalent. One-way.
Fleet Management	AssetWorks	API or automated equivalent. One-way.

END OF EXHIBIT A

END OF ADDENDUM NUMBER 1