Transportation Demand Management Software and Services RFP

Questions and Answers

1. **Could you clarify ARC's expectations regarding the ownership and licensing of intellectual property developed as part of the software delivered as part of this SOW?**

   Our expectation is to lease proprietary software through reoccurring license and maintenance fees. However, our expectation is that ARC will own the data that is produced and collected.

2. **What is ARC's budget range for the design and proof-of-concept phase of software development and then each subsequent year?**

   We anticipate a budget range of $36,000-96,000 annually

3. **What are the current systems ARC uses to managing customized incentives programs or promotions?**

   We currently use RidePro by TripSpark for ridematching and Virtual Incentives for incentive programs.

4. **What are some examples of potential "additional incentives" that could be built into the software?**

   Any data-driven incentives that support behavior change. Some examples can include but are not limited to: gamification, community-driven events or campaigns, user and company competition, and user reward points.

5. **Is ARC open to a design-phase to better define requirements and priorities? For example, to satisfy the stated functional requirements: Allow for multiple customizable portals for TMA and employer websites accessing central database - is there an understanding of which portals should be prioritized based on which users will gain greatest value from access? Is there an understanding of which users should be targeted for ride-sharing incentives via the software first? Has there been a feasibility assessment conducted to evaluate the cost of integrating software with existing systems?**

   Yes, we are open to a design phase to customize the software to meet the needs of the Atlanta Region, but we also expect the scope of work to be completed within the timeline specified in the RFP. The requirements for customizable TMA and employer portals could be met by administrative access to TMA and employer's data via a website. There is not a priority for TMAs, we expect for all TMAs to Go-Live at once. However, it does not have to be limited to a single administrative portal. We welcome creativity and innovation.

6. **Does the RFP have an official number that we should refer to, or should we just refer to it by name?**

   The RFP does not have an official number. Please refer to it by name.

7. **Page 1 states "award a one-year contract, with the option of two one-year renewals. Each contract renewal period will include an updated scope and work plan." With this in mind, do you want pricing for 1 year or all 3 years?**

   We would prefer the pricing to be broken down annually, but year one to include any project management or development hours.

8. **If pricing is required for all 3 years, should we assume the scope of work for years 2 and 3 will be similar to year 1?**

   The scope of work for year one should be focused on implementation, whereas the scope of work for year two and three should focus on, support and maintenance, and the flexibility for improvements.

9. **How many users are enrolled in the current database?**

   29,138 as of February 8th

10. **How many of these users are actively logging trips each month/year?**

    4,757 actively logging trips

11. **How many of your incentives (e.g., Gimme Five, $25 Prizes, etc.) do you send out each month?**

    Estimated 540

12. **Are all of these incentives physically mailed or are they electronically fulfilled?**

    A user currently has the option to redeem rewards virtually or be mailed a physical card.

13. **Does ARC handle the incentive fulfillment in-house or is it contracted out?**

    It is currently contracted out.

14. **Does ARC have a budget, or not-to-exceed amount for this procurement?**

    We anticipate a budget range of $36,000-96,000 annually

15. Is this the complete list of TMAs that will be using the service, or are there more?

1. Perimeter Connects
2. Livable Buckhead
3. Clifton Corridor
4. Central Atlanta Progress
5. AERO
6. Midtown Transportation
7. ASAP

Yes, this is the complete list. However, companies or commuters outside of these TMA boundaries fall under Georgia Commute Options (GCO).

16. How many employer portals do you have today?

We have zero employer portals to date.

17. How many vanpools do you currently have?

294 vanpools.

18. What percent of your vans are Enterprise vanpools?

86 percent

19. What is the impact on the evaluation criteria if the proposal does, or does not, meet the DBE participation goal? The reason we ask is because the evaluation criteria listed on Page 5 does not seem to include a score/factor based on DBE participation.

The ARC has an overall DBE participation goal, and as a result, all contractors should make an effort to include DBE participation where feasible and possible to deliver the scope of a contract. We do not have contract goals in our DBE Policy. More information can be found at this link: **https://atlantaregional.org/about-arc/business-services-finance/arc-business-opportunities/**

20. Does a DBE need to be a certified by the Georgia Department of Transportation or will you accept DBE certifications from other states/entities?

DBEs must be certified in the state of Georgia to be counted towards participation.

21. Is ARC required to publicly disclose proposals? If so, can we submit a redacted version of the proposal for potential public dissemination?

The ARC is subject to compliance with Open Records Act, so potentially any and all documents or communications may be released to comply with the Open Records Act. No part of any response may be redacted in advance. The ARC does not proactively post responses to RFPs as a standard policy. Propriety information may be marked confidential; however, it would be on the burden of the proposal to justify the reasons the information is confidential. Any confidential sections must be labeled as confidential. The entire proposal cannot be marked a confidential.

22. **We noticed you only requested 1 printed copy. We're happy to submit multiple printed copies for your committee so you don't have to go through the trouble of printing them. Just let us know how many printed copies you would like and we'd be happy to send them!**

   The ARC will prepare all necessary materials for those on the review committee.

23. **To allow enough time to assemble a thoughtful and comprehensive proposal for ARC, we respectfully request a three week extension of the submission deadline to March 15, 2019.**

   From a project focus, we have a tight timeline that we prefer to adhere to. Proposals are due Friday, February 22, 2019 as stated in the proposal.

24. **Is ARC able to provide any more detail re: the status or likelihood of ARC receiving funding from the Georgia Department of Transportation for this contract? Is the funding in any way tied to ARC's evaluation of the vendor's proposal? Under what conditions would ARC award only part of the available funds for this project?**

   ARC has secured funding from GDOT for this project for the current year. Based on proposals received, ARC may award all or parts of the available funds for this project.

25. **We would like to understand the size of the contract opportunity as best as possible. Given the large number of functional requirements and level of integration with other entities/platforms required, the requested software and services would require considerable investment. Is there a maximum contract budget?**

   We anticipate a budget range of $36,000-96,000 annually

26. **The RFP states that following the initial one-year award, there is an option for two one-year renewals. How will ARC define success for the first year? What criteria will it use to evaluate and decide on the renewal option?**

   ARC views success during the first year as full implementation of the software, along with innovative solutions and technical support. Renewal terms will be agreed upon in the contract.

27. **The RFP states that the ideal software will be able to integrate with a variety of other technical platforms and applications, including various "Secure API integrations",**

employer portals, social media platforms, transportation mobile apps, etc. Is it entirely the vendor's responsibility for engaging with various other public and private entities to negotiate and facilitate these integrations, and to assume the full cost of doing so? What will be ARC's level of involvement/authority in facilitating the vendor's ability to integrate with other entities?

It is not our intention for the vendor to take full responsibility to facilitate relationships. However, we expect the vendor to seek partnerships to accomplish integrations highlighted in the RFP.

28. **Requirement #7 states that the software must support "customized incentive programs or promotions as directed by ARC." Can ARC provide more details on the nature of these incentive programs and promotions? How much notice and what level of guidance will ARC provide when requesting the inclusion of these programs? It is difficult to scope the sophistication and requirements of the software without better understanding the type of modifications and customization that will be required.**

All incentive programs are highlighted in the RFP and programs are typically campaigns that focus on modes. ARC will provide guidance with ample notice in how the software can compliment these programs.

29. **Requirement #9 states that a proposed schedule for "the transition from the current system" needs to be included as part of the proposal. We would like to better understand the "current system" - is this the entirety of the TDM program? Is it only the Georgia Commute Option Program?**

Georgia Commute Options and its ridematching software is not the entirety of the TDM programs. Current system is RidePro by Trip Spark. More information on the Georgia Commute Options portal can be found on our website http://gacommuteoptions.com/

30. **For the software's ridematching functionality (Exhibit A, Function 3), are the described features intended to be part of an entirely new real-time, dynamic shared ride service, or simply features that match users to existing ridehailing/vanpool/TNC/etc. modes and services currently available in the Atlanta region? Would the vendor be expected to integrate with these existing services, or provide our own solution only to users that download the software/mobile app?**

At minimum, the vendor is expected to provide multi-modal ridematching tools. The expectation is also for the vendor to bring new ideas (which could include dynamic ridesharing service as well).

31. **For technology & integration (Exhibit A, Function 8), the vendor is required to offer mobile applications with "full functionality." Could ARC provide more detail on what "full" functionality means? Does this mean that the mobile and desktop web browser**

applications will have the same requirements and level of functionality?

Yes, it is ARC's intention that the mobile app and the web page have the same level of functionality. ARC defines full functionality as participating in incentive and ridematching programs.

32. **For migration services (Exhibit A, Function 9), ARC requires that the vendor migrate current registrant data and historical reporting data. Can ARC provide further detail on what it means by migrating this data, and the goal of the migration? In what format and systems is this data? Are these systems/databases owned and operated by ARC, or by other stakeholders/private entities? If the latter, will ARC facilitate the migration/interaction with other entities?**

The goal is to migrate every active commuter and transition all incentive applications, while also having discussions around historical data. The current format is a SQL database. That database is owned by ARC, and all data collected from the ridematching software is owned by ARC. ARC will work with the selected vendor to import data into the new database.

33. **Is ARC willing to accept and discuss, as part of the proposal, potential exceptions to the RFP language, (e.g. specific requirements around data sharing and ownership)?**
The expectation for this contract is that ARC will retain ownership of current data and will own all data collected during the contract period.

The expectation for this contract is that ARC will retain ownership of current data and will own all data collected during the contract period.

34. **Is the pricing template provided by ARC in Exhibit B the required format for pricing, or may we submit our own pricing structure/format?**

You may include a different format as additional information, but Exhibit B must also be provided as a requirement of the proposal.

35. **The RFP states that training and support will need to be provided for ARC staff, stakeholders and users. Who are the primary stakeholders at ARC and what will their use of the software entail? What are the other stakeholder organizations, and what will their role be/use of the software be? Is the intention that ARC and its partners/stakeholders will actively manage the software during the contract period?**

The primary stakeholders that will be using the software will be the Mobility Services Group at ARC and the TMAs. We are open to a 'train the trainer' format. We expect the vendor to maintain their software; however, the expectation is that ARC and its contractors will fully administer the software.

36. **From our experience developing, launching and operating on-demand transportation services around the world, we understand that effective program/product marketing is critical to drive user engagement, especially early on. The RFP does not mention a marketing requirement or plan, beyond integrating with social media and providing individual user training? How does ARC intend to market the software? Does ARC expect that the vendor will undertake marketing efforts?**

Marketing efforts will be handled by the marketing team in ARC's Mobility Services Group.

37. **As the RFP indicates, the respondent is expected to include innovate approaches or solutions. As such, if a mobile platform meets all the requirements in the RFP what are the minimum requirements that the web-based component needs to meet?**

Our expectation is that the mobile platform and web site has the same functionality.

38. **Does the solution require an interface that provides one view of all transportation options or is ARC open to accepting alternative solutions (e.g.) that reduce traffic congestion?**

Not necessarily, we welcome creative and innovative solutions.

39. **Which of the regional TDM incentives programs have been most successful? Could we make new suggestions for incentives?**
It varies, we define success as anything that creates behavior change. We welcome creative and innovative ideas.

40. **What regional TDM programs and initiatives is ARC looking to promote the greatest participation?**

ARC is looking promote all TDM programs and incentives to increase participation.

41. **Is ARC seeking a solution for all commuters (B2C) or a solution that is employer-centric that then they can roll out to their employees (B2B2C)**

 ARC is seeking both commuter and employer solutions.

42. **For training and support services, how many personnel would need training? Who are ARC's partners that would require training?**

The primary partners that will be using the software will be the Mobility Services Group at ARC and the TMAs. We are open to a 'train the trainer' format.

43. **What is the budget allocated to this procurement?**

We anticipate a budget range of $36,000-96,000 annually

44. **May we exclude a cover sheet, table of contents, and standard product sheets from the 25 page limit?**

Yes, these items do not count toward the 25 page limit.

45. On page 8, second point under System and Portal Functionality, you state "Allow for program branding and integrate with TMA branding, and be capable of capturing reporting at the individual module level." Please elaborate on what you mean by "Individual module level"

An individual user should be able to see their impacts (i.e. pollution savings, miles logged, etc).

46. Has a method for evaluating proposals been established, such as a points or weight system? If so, would you elaborate on how proposals will be evaluated?

Yes, as stated in the RFP:

Evaluation criteria is the following:
1. Technical Approach including innovation (45%)
2. Related experience, qualifications, and references of the firm or project team (25%)
3. Customer service (10%)
4. Added value/best value (10%)
5. Cost (10%)

47. Is multimodal trip planning a must have, or will Google maps suffice?

A multimodal trip planner is a must have. Google API will suffice if supporting research can be provided on why it should be used over other APIs.

48. Will the TMA be responsible for managing and registering users?

Yes, but not solely responsible. User's should be able to register themselves as well.