April 21, 2016

To: All Interested Parties

From: Beverly Adamo
        Director of Administrative Services

RE: RFP for LAVTA Adaptive Signal Control Technology Services #2016-05

        Addendum Number 1

This correspondence constitutes official record of the first alteration of the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA) "Request for Proposals for Adaptive Signal Control Technology Services #2016-05" issued on March 31, 2016.

This Addendum includes:

1. Change in Proposal Due date to Tuesday, May 3, 2016 at 2:00 pm Pacific Time.

2. Change the number of proposals submitted to Section I, Instructions to Proposers – paragraph 1.9 and any other references to:

> Proposers shall submit **one (1) original and four (6) hard copies AND one (1) electronic version** of its proposal on a CD or USB drive, addressed as shown above, bearing the Proposer's name and address, and clearly marked as follows:

> **"LAVTA Adaptive Signal Control Technology Services– RFP #2016-05"**

3. Responds to written questions as follows:

QUESTION	RESPONSE
1. Requirements Reference Number – 2.2.0-6 – Please clarify the performance need or outcome of the requirement to limit changes to offset adjustment to not exceed a user-specified range? In|Sync is not dependent upon an offset adjustment, so we would like clarification of the performance goal.	Requirement 2.2.0-6 states "the ASCT shall limit changes in offset adjustment to not exceed a user-specified range." This requirement supports objective 4.9-02 from the ConOps which states "the system needs to be able to provide dynamic directional offset adjustments that have the ability for a user defined maximum delta range." The point of this objective and requirement is to allow the system to operate adaptively while maintaining the City of Dublin's ability to control the overall operation. Requirements 2.2.0-4, 2.2.0-4.0-1 and 2.2.0-6 support objective 4.9-02 have been changed

	from Mandatory to Desirable. The Proposer may propose an alternative means of achieving this requirement as part of their proposal.
2. Requirements Reference Number – 14.0-7.0-5 through 14.046 and 18.0-4 – Please clarify the performance need or outcome desired for the entire 14.0 requirements as they appear to relate to integration into ATMS.now and are feature-based and not performance-based outcomes. In|Sync doesn't hinder or integrate with the ATMS.now platform. Please clarify if these requirements will be modified to exhibit performance-based outcomes or deleted from the RFP entirely.	Requirements 14.0-7.0.5 through 14.0-46 support the following objectives from the ConOps: 4.10-03, 4.10-04, 4.10-05, 4.15-02, 4.15-03, 4.15-04, 4.15-05, 4.15-06, 4.15-07, 4-15-08, 4.15-09 and 4.11-05. LAVTA/City of Dublin is open to proposals that allow the project to achieve all the goals included in the ConOps and listed in Appendix B – Traceability Matrix. Requirement 14.046 is changed from Mandatory to Desirable. If the ASCT system is to operate on top of the existing ATMS.now system, it is the overall objective of this project that the two systems coexist together with little to no issues.
3. A number of mandatory requirements indicate a pre-selected vendor due to the nature of the specified functionality. These requirements indicate a system operational preference / mandate rather than a goal for the ASCT. Of considerable concern are requirements that mandate interaction with and control through the existing ATMS. These specifications either a) effectively narrow the field of choice to the one vendor who already provides the ATMS, or b) put an unfair burden of additional software development and integration on other vendors desiring to participate in the bid. These requirements heavily indicate the preference of a pre-selected vendor. If this is not the case, Rhythm strongly encourages LAVTA to review and revise the above requirements to be goal-oriented and allow for flexibility of offerings, rather than solution- or system-specific requirements in order to encourage the fairness of the value-oriented process and equal participation of all participating vendors. (a) Will LAVTA review and update the vendor-specific requirements listed above to allow for fair participation by multiple	LAVTA/City of Dublin is open to proposals that allow the project to achieve all the goals included in the ConOps and listed in Appendix B – Traceability Matrix. For all the requirements that cannot be met, the Proposer may propose an alternative means of achieving this requirement as part of their proposal. Several requirements in Appendix A and Appendix B have been revised from Mandatory to Desirable. These requirements are listed below and are highlighted in Appendix A and Appendix B: • 2.2.0-4 • 2.2.0-4.0-1 • 2.2.0-6 • 6.0-1 • 6.0-1.0-1 • 6.0-1.0-2 • 6.0-1.0-3 • 6.0-1.0-4 • 6.0-1.0-5 • 6.0-1.0-6 • 6.0-1.0-7 • 6.0-1.0-8 • 6.0-3 • 6.0-4 • 6.0-5 • 6.0-7 • 6.0-12 • 6.0-15 • 6.0-16

vendors through flexible, goal-oriented requirements? (b) Has LAVTA pre-selected a vendor, or does LAVTA heavily favor a vendor?	• 7.0-2 • 7.0-3 • 7.0-4 • 7.0-5 • 7.0-6 • 7.0-6.0-1 • 7.0-6.0-2 • 7.0-6.0-3 • 7.0-7 • 7.0-8 • 7.0-9 • 7.0-11 • 7.0-13 • 12.0-9 • 12.0-10 • 12.0-11 • 12.0-12 • 13.1.0-3 • 14.0-1 • 14.0-1.0-1 • 14.0-46
4. Since In|Sync calculates actual delay of individual movements and queue lengths based on video, infrared or radar-based detection, will LATVA consider other forms of detection for the RFP?	LAVTA/City of Dublin will consider other forms of detection. However, the cost of the new detection, as well as the long-term maintenance needs and costs for the new detection, will be taken into account when evaluating the proposal. If the two systems are equal, there should not be any concerns.
5. What changes is the city planning to make to the existing detection at any of the intersections? Some adaptive systems require installation and maintenance of loops, and advanced loops. If these costs are not being quantified within this RFP, how is that being accounted for? In|Sync includes all detection it needs, and the cost for this is included in our price. Since price is an evaluation criterion in this RFP, and In|Sync's ability to adaptively control the system does not require advance loop installation or maintenance, will the city assure us that the requisite adjustments to the total price will be made so that a fair proposal evaluation and competition in ensured?	The comment is correct, in that this RFP is for the procurement of the adaptive signal control system, and that any additional detection needed will be procured separately. If a proposer's bid price includes detection, these costs must be called out separately, such that a fair apples-to-apples cost comparison can be made across all vendor bids.
6. **System Requirements be generalized**	LAVTA/City of Dublin is open to proposals that allow

to foster innovation--- Related to #3 and above, we respectfully request that System Requirements be generalized and not constrained to allow for a wide range of systems to compete. Instead of listing specific features, we respectfully request LATVA place an emphasis on the past performance of a system, demonstrating proven delivered accomplishments in terms of improved traffic operations and safety.	the project to achieve all the goals included in the ConOps and listed in Appendix B – Traceability Matrix. For all the requirements that cannot be met, the Proposer may propose an alternative means of achieving this requirement as part of their proposal.
7. Scope of Work – Section E – In|Sync doesn't rely upon a server for instructions to each ATCS however it appears that LATVA expects the installation of a server and backup server. Please clarify the performance goal of having a server installed within the Dublin's TOC. Additionally, will LATVA allow for a non-server based solution which doesn't rely upon a server to provide adaptive operations?	LAVTA/City of Dublin will need to have a server to collect and analyze the whole system on a long-term basis. If a proposer's system can provide this functionality without a server, this is acceptable to the City of Dublin. However, this solution must be clearly described in the proposal. The RFP Scope of Work outlines the tasks that LAVTA/City of Dublin envisions will best meet the needs and requirements of this project. However, the Proposer may suggest changes to the scope in their proposal if they feel these changes are a more effective and efficient method of achieving the project's goals.
8. Since this is not a professional services (consulting) type of project, will LAVTA consider removing Professional Liability Insurance requirements as outlined on p.29? The deliverables are all related to system integration and software delivery. In the event that future tasks or change order requests involved use or need of professional (engineering) services, would the proposer be allowed to retain or subcontract to a professional services engineering firm, who could provide a certificate of insurance for such work?	While this contract is not for professional engineering services, the consultant will still be providing professional services and must have professional liability insurance in accordance with the RFP.
9. On p.35 It requires that the prospective vendor submit financial statements and income/balance sheets. Since most companies proposing on this requirement will be privately held entities, will LAVTA consider removing this requirement	Prospective vendors are required to demonstrate their financial strength, stability, capacity and resources. Proposers can meet this requirement through balance sheets and income statements or through alternative methods. LAVTA reserves the right to request additional evidence of financial stability if it determines that the alternative documentation is insufficient.
10. Can LAVTA provide the system requirements matrix (checklist) in .docx or .xlsx format?	Yes. These will be posted online with the other RFP documents.

11. How are 6x6 loops configured? Is each loop input on a separate channel? Are loops tied together? If they are tied, are they tied within the same lane, and/or are they tied across multiple lanes?	The loops are tied together at seven intersections. The rest are all separate channels. A separate procurement will be conducted for providing required detection, which could include loops, cameras, radar, etc.
12. RFP Section II Scope of Work, Section 1.2.D states, "The system vendor has the option of installing their firmware on existing Naztec 2070 controller hardware, or supplying [new 2070 controllers]…", with (18) complete controller units required. Our approach will allow for the first option of installing new (adaptive signal) firmware onto the existing Naztec 2070 controllers, and we feel that it's highly likely that all other proposers will have the same approach. However, we've noticed that according to the original installation dates, the existing CPU modules in many of the project locations are either at, or near end of their hardware life cycles. According, we're concerned that updating the firmware may be initially successful, but may expose the project to unexpected future maintenance failures either during, or shortly after the project deployment and acceptance period, at one or more locations, due to the current average age of 8+ years of field operation. Therefore, our question is as follows: On Pricing Cost Proposal Attachment A, Item 6 "Furnish Traffic Controllers", Would LAVTA consider an amendment to either redefine, or allow submission of an alternative cost item, to allow the proposers to include a limited Model 2070 hardware upgrade in the proposal? This would be in the form of an Advanced Transportation Controller (ATC) platform Model 2070-1C processor card module (Dual 100MB Ethernet & USB support), containing the required adaptive signal control software, to exchange and replace the legacy Model 2070-1B processor card modules (single	Yes, LAVTA would allow submission of an alternative cost item for hardware upgrades. However, this must be clearly identified as a separate optional cost item.

10MB Ethernet, No USB support), in the existing field controllers? This approach would allow the more ruggedized controller hardware components to continue operating, while replacing the highest failure rate device, the main CPU module. If the answer is YES, would this item be optional or mandatory? What would the required revised total CPU quantity be?	
13. Under the Format section on page 1, the RFP states, "Proposals should not exceed twenty (20) pages in length." Should we interpret this as meaning a 40-page response, printed double-sided on 20 sheets of paper is acceptable?	Per the RFP, Section III, 1.1, "Proposals should not exceed twenty (20) pages in length **excluding any appendices**. Page limit applies to Proposer's Qualifications, Experience and References and Technical Proposal section." This means 20 pages, NOT 20 pieces of paper (i.e., one double sided printed sheet of paper would count as two pages).

Other than those specifically listed above, no other sections, terms or conditions of the above cited solicitation are being altered at this time. All other sections, conditions and language not specifically cited as altered in this document are still in full and original effect.

Submitted:

/s/ Beverly Adamo   04/21/16
Beverly Adamo, Director of Administrative Services   Date

Attachment: (note this is one workbook with two spreadsheets/tabs)
    Appendix A: Requirements
    Appendix B: Traceability Matrix