

**Tulare County Regional Transit Agency**  
RFP #2026-01 Electronic Fare Payment System

Response to Proposer Questions

Number	Question	Answer
1	What is the correct physical address for proposal delivery?	Proposals should be mailed to:  Tulare County Regional Transit Agency Attn: Derek Winning - RFP #2026-01 200 E Center Avenue, Visalia, California 93291
2	Will BAFO allow scope refinement?	If conducted, a Best and Final Offer process may allow for refinement of pricing and clarification or minor refinement of scope, as determined by the Agency. The Agency reserves the right to limit BAFO submissions to price revisions only or to request additional clarifications as needed.
3	Will BAFO be limited to price revisions only?	If conducted, a Best and Final Offer process may allow for refinement of pricing and clarification or minor refinement of scope, as determined by the Agency. The Agency reserves the right to limit BAFO submissions to price revisions only or to request additional clarifications as needed.
4	Will existing CAD/AVL systems remain unchanged?	Yes, all Agencies expect their CAD/AVL systems to remain unchanged.
5	Which system is the system of record for ridership?	Currently, each participating agency maintains its own system of record for ridership:  Tulare County Regional Transit Agency (TCRTA) – Genfare Garage Reports  Visalia Transit – Synchromatics  Kings Area Rural Transit (KART) – UTA  Porterville Transit – Tripshot (AVL)  Under this procurement, the selected Proposer shall provide a centralized system of record for ridership data as part of the proposed fare collection system. The system of record must be fully capable, reliable, and suitable for regulatory reporting and audit purposes.
6	Which system is the system of record for GPS accuracy?	Currently, each participating agency maintains its own CAD/AVL system, which serves as the system of record for GPS location data and accuracy.  Proposers are directed to the "SOW Current On-Board Network Environment" Section of the RFP (Page 4-5) for additional information regarding existing CAD/AVL systems utilized by each agency.
7	How should discrepancies between CAD/AVL and AFC data be resolved?	Integration with CAD/AVL systems is not required under the base scope. The proposed solution must independently record all necessary transaction and ridership data to support reporting requirements. If discrepancies arise between AFC and any external data sources, the Proposer shall describe the tools or processes within their solution to identify and address such discrepancies.
8	Is normalization across multiple CAD vendors required?	Data normalization across multiple CAD/AVL vendors is not required unless integration is proposed, in which case the Agencies will work with the selected Proposer to address alignment based on the proposed architecture.
9	Is API-based integration acceptable?	Yes.
10	What level of historical CAD/AVL data migration is required?	The Agency does not require full historical CAD/AVL data migration. However, the proposed solution should have the capability to migrate historical data in the future if needed for reporting or analytics purposes.
11	Will GPS data be obtained through AVL integration?	The method for obtaining GPS data is left to the proposer. The proposed system must be capable of providing location-specific data associated with boardings and fare transactions. Proposers shall describe their approach for capturing and associating transaction data with accurate location information.
12	Is annual maintenance expected after the warranty period?	Proposers shall include maintenance and support pricing for the life of the agreement and clearly identify warranty coverage and any ongoing support costs following the warranty period.
13	Is a requirements compliance matrix required as part of the proposal?	Please see addendum No.7 for information regarding the required matrix.
14	What format is required for a compliance matrix?	Please see addendum No.7 for information regarding the required matrix.
15	Can future agencies join under the same contract terms?	The Agency has not made a determination regarding participation by future agencies. Any expansion of the contract to additional agencies would be subject to applicable procurement requirements and mutual agreement of the parties.
16	Will agencies be allowed to opt out after contract award?	Yes. Participating agencies may elect to enter into individual agreements with the selected vendor rather than participate under a single master agreement. Any such individual agreements would be subject to the terms and conditions established through this procurement.
17	How will change orders be governed once the system is live?	Participating agencies may enter into individual agreements with the selected vendor. Change orders shall be administered and governed in accordance with the terms outlined in each agency's individual contract.
18	Is a SaaS business model acceptable?  (In other words, is cloud-based software allowed?)	The Agency is open to any solution that meets the requirements and expectations outlined in this solicitation.
19	Will contracts be identical across all agencies?	Participating agencies may enter into individual agreements with the selected vendor. While contracts may include agency-specific provisions, they are expected to remain consistent with the overall framework and requirements established through this solicitation.
20	Will contracts be customized per agency?	Participating agencies may enter into individual agreements with the selected vendor. While contracts may include agency-specific provisions, they are expected to remain consistent with the overall framework and requirements established through this solicitation.
21	When does the warranty period begin?	Please see addendum No.7 for information regarding warranty.

22	Is warranty triggered region-wide or per agency?	Participating agencies may execute individual agreements with the selected vendor. Accordingly, warranty terms and any associated triggers will be governed by each agency's individual contract.
23	What is the duration of this contract? The requested warranty for several items is 3 years, but there is no other mention of when the contract will expire.	See addendum No. 4.
24	What is the contract length for the submitted proposals?	See addendum No. 4.
25	To what extent are the "General Terms and Conditions" in the RFP negotiable? Shall we include a copy of our standard agreements as a basis for negotiation?	The General Terms and Conditions include provisions required by applicable federal and state regulations and funding requirements, which are not negotiable. Other provisions may be subject to discussion and refinement during contract negotiations, at the Agency's discretion.  Proposers may include a copy of their standard agreement for reference; however, the Agency's required terms will prevail where applicable.
26	In Section 1 (c) of the General Terms and Conditions, it states that "The Agencies are exempt from Federal Excise and Transportation Taxes." Does this mean the agencies are exempt from sales tax on all equipment purchases?	No, sales tax applies to all applicable line items on the submitted proposals.
27	Will agencies consider extending the proposal submission deadline?	Please see addendum No. 6 for updated proposal submission dates.
28	We would like to request a three-week extension to the submission deadline for Electronic Fare Payment System -RFP #2026-01.	Please see addendum No. 6 for updated proposal submission dates.
29	Given the limited interval between the issuance of responses to vendor inquiries and the current proposal due date, we believe additional time is necessary to complete a thorough and well-considered response. An extension would enable us to incorporate all relevant clarifications and potential addenda, thereby ensuring our proposal is both comprehensive and aligned with TCRTA's objectives.	Please see addendum No. 6 for updated proposal submission dates.
30	What is the expected monthly EMV transaction volume?	Based on available data for FY 25 (July 2024 – June 2025), ridership levels are as follows: City of Visalia Transit: 620,000; City of Porterville Transit: 360,000; TCRTA: 380,000; and KART: 530,000.
31	What percentage of riders currently use monthly passes for each agency?	Detailed monthly pass utilization percentages by Agency are not currently available, as fare product usage data is undergoing reconciliation. Proposers should not rely on a fixed percentage assumption and should instead describe how their solution supports flexible fare product configurations and provides robust reporting capabilities to track and analyze monthly pass usage by Agency.
32	What is the total annual fare revenue across all agencies?	Based on available data for FY 25 (July 2024 – June 2025), annual fare revenue by Agency is as follows: City of Visalia Transit: \$860,000; City of Porterville Transit: \$362,000; TCRTA: \$519,000; and KART: 713,587.96.
33	What is the annual fare revenue by agency?	Based on available data for FY 25 (July 2024 – June 2025), annual fare revenue by Agency is as follows: City of Visalia Transit: \$860,000; City of Porterville Transit: \$362,000; TCRTA: \$519,000; and KART: 713,587.96.
34	What are the annual transaction volumes by payment type for each agency?	Based on available data for FY 25 (July 2024 – June 2025), ridership levels are as follows: City of Visalia Transit: 620,000; City of Porterville Transit: 360,000; TCRTA: 380,000; and KART: 530,000.
35	What is the percentage breakdown of fare payments by collection method?	All agencies collect cash.
36	What is the average fare value per transaction?	Here is the fixed route fare price per agency: City of Visalia Transit: 1.75 City of Porterville Transit: 1.50 TCRTA: 1.50 Local/ 2.00 Commuter KART: 1.25 Local/1.75 Commuter  You can find more detail information about each agency's individual fare structures on their websites.
37	What are the monthly ridership statistics for the past 12–24 months?	Based on available data for FY 25 (July 2024 – June 2025), ridership levels are as follows: City of Visalia Transit: 620,000; City of Porterville Transit: 360,000; TCRTA: 380,000; and KART: 530,000.
38	Are fare policies expected to change during the contract term?	The Agencies are working toward a uniform regional fare structure. However, independent fare policies and pricing may still apply by agency. The fare collection system must support independent agency-level management within the back-office, including the ability to configure, manage, and report fares separately as needed.
39	What level of fare interoperability is required at launch?	The Agency is seeking a unified fare collection solution. At launch, the system must support interoperability across participating agencies, including shared fare media.
40	Is cash handling excluded from the scope of this procurement?	Yes, cash handling is excluded from the scope of this procurement. However, the proposed solution must provide a method to record and report cash payments for reconciliation and reporting purposes.
41	Does the region intend to establish a governing authority or lead agency to disburse fare revenues?	The region does not currently intend to establish a single governing authority for fare revenue disbursement. The proposed solution must support multiple back-office configurations. At minimum, the system shall support:  • A separate back-office environment for Kings Area Regional Transit; and • Either a centralized back office for the Tulare County agencies or separate back-office environments for individual Tulare County agencies, as determined by those agencies.  The system must be flexible to accommodate both centralized and distributed administrative structures within the unified platform.

42	Will funds be distributed regionally based on sales and ridership?	The region does not currently intend to establish a single governing authority for fare revenue disbursement. The proposed solution must support multiple back-office configurations. At minimum, the system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate back-office environment for Kings Area Regional Transit; and</li> <li>• Either a centralized back office for the Tulare County agencies or separate back-office environments for individual Tulare County agencies, as determined by those agencies.</li> </ul> The system must be flexible to accommodate both centralized and distributed administrative structures within the unified platform.
43	Will agencies receive fare revenues directly and reconcile inter-agency reimbursements?	The region does not currently intend to establish a single governing authority for fare revenue disbursement. The proposed solution must support multiple back-office configurations. At minimum, the system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate back-office environment for Kings Area Regional Transit; and</li> <li>• Either a centralized back office for the Tulare County agencies or separate back-office environments for individual Tulare County agencies, as determined by those agencies.</li> </ul> The system must be flexible to accommodate both centralized and distributed administrative structures within the unified platform.
44	Will riders maintain a single regional account or separate agency wallets?	The region does not currently intend to establish a single governing authority for fare revenue disbursement. The proposed solution must support multiple back-office configurations. At minimum, the system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate back-office environment for Kings Area Regional Transit; and</li> <li>• Either a centralized back office for the Tulare County agencies or separate back-office environments for individual Tulare County agencies, as determined by those agencies.</li> </ul> The system must be flexible to accommodate both centralized and distributed administrative structures within the unified platform.
45	How should revenue disputes between agencies be resolved?	The region does not currently intend to establish a single governing authority for fare revenue disbursement. The proposed solution must support multiple back-office configurations. At minimum, the system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate back-office environment for Kings Area Regional Transit; and</li> <li>• Either a centralized back office for the Tulare County agencies or separate back-office environments for individual Tulare County agencies, as determined by those agencies.</li> </ul> The system must be flexible to accommodate both centralized and distributed administrative structures within the unified platform.
46	Will revenue clearing occur in real time, daily batch, or monthly?	The specific clearing methodology (e.g., real-time or batch processing) is left to the proposer. However, all transactions must be fully reconciled and cleared no later than the beginning of the following month.
47	Which entity is responsible for fare revenue administration?	The region does not currently intend to establish a single governing authority for fare revenue disbursement. The proposed solution must support multiple back-office configurations. At minimum, the system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate back-office environment for Kings Area Regional Transit; and</li> <li>• Either a centralized back office for the Tulare County agencies or separate back-office environments for individual Tulare County agencies, as determined by those agencies.</li> </ul> The system must be flexible to accommodate both centralized and distributed administrative structures within the unified platform.
48	Which entity is responsible for fare revenue allocation?	The region does not currently intend to establish a single governing authority for fare revenue disbursement. The proposed solution must support multiple back-office configurations. At minimum, the system shall support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate back-office environment for Kings Area Regional Transit; and</li> <li>• Either a centralized back office for the Tulare County agencies or separate back-office environments for individual Tulare County agencies, as determined by those agencies.</li> </ul> The system must be flexible to accommodate both centralized and distributed administrative structures within the unified platform.
49	How frequently are fare policy changes anticipated?	The Agencies are working toward a uniform regional fare structure. However, independent fare policies and pricing may still apply by agency. The fare collection system must support independent agency-level management within the back-office, including the ability to configure, manage, and report fares separately as needed.
50	Are fare capping programs anticipated?	Yes.
51	Are equity-based fare programs anticipated?	Yes.
52	Are free or discounted transfers anticipated?	Yes.
53	Should agency-specific fare logic be supported within a regional system?	Yes.
54	Is TCRTA interested in having each jurisdiction accept contactless EMV debit/credit cards and Mobile Wallets (Apple Pay, Google Pay, Samsung Pay)? This isn't specified in the proposal.	Yes, this is a joint procurement between the four agencies.
55	Fare structure: Will each agency have its own fare policies and structure, to be managed independently with the back-office?	The Agencies are working toward a uniform regional fare structure. However, independent fare policies and pricing may still apply by agency. The fare collection system must support independent agency-level management within the back-office, including the ability to configure, manage, and report fares separately as needed.
56	Which Genfare farebox models are currently deployed at each agency?	TCRTA - Genfare Fast Fare Model Visalia Transit and KART - Genfare Odyssey Porterville Transit - None
57	The RFP states that Kings Area Rural Transit has Odyssey fareboxes. Can you confirm that Kings Area Rural Transit has Fast Fare fareboxes? Kings Area Rural Transit has purchased more than 10 Fast Fare fareboxes since 2020.	KART utilizes both Odyssey and Fast Fare fareboxes.
58	The Pricing Schedule you supplied does not contain a line item for hardware or equipment. Why is that?	The Pricing Schedule provided is a summary form. Proposers shall include all costs associated with their proposed solution, including any required hardware or equipment, and may attach additional detailed pricing schedules as necessary to fully itemize and explain those costs.

59	Please confirm that integration with existing fare-collection equipment/fareboxes is not required?	Integration with existing fare-collection equipment/fareboxes is not required.
60	Will existing fare collection equipment remain unchanged?	The proposed system will be used for electronic fare payment. Agencies may continue to use their existing onboard equipment for cash collection. The solution must support the recording and reporting of cash transactions for reconciliation and reporting purposes.
61	Does this RFP include the procurement of new fareboxes? We ask because Porterville, Visalia, TCRTA, and Kings Area Rural Transit purchased Fast Fare fareboxes in 2018, 2022, 2022, and 2024, respectively. Additionally, the Fast Fares purchased by Visalia, Tulare, and Kings Area Rural Transit are equipped with open-payment smart card readers and barcode readers for contactless EMV debit/credit card and mobile app acceptance, respectively. Those options simply need to be enabled through a SaaS subscription.	The intent of this RFP is not to purchase fareboxes unless that is the proposer's solution to the mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection systems utilizing debit card, credit card, prepaid cards, mobile wallet, and in-app payment described within the solicitation documents.
62	If you will be procuring new fareboxes for this RFP, can you please list the quantities of fareboxes you will purchase for:  a.Porterville b.Visalia c.Tulare County d.Kings Area Rural Transit	The intent of the RFP is to procure a mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection system solution that utilizes debit cards, credit cards, prepaid cards, mobile wallets, and in-app payments, as described in the solicitation documents.
63	If you are procuring new fareboxes, what type of payment features are required to be included on the farebox?	The mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection systems that use debit cards, credit cards, prepaid cards, mobile wallets, and in-app payments are described in the solicitation documents.
64	14. On page #6, it states "The AFC system shall address all phases of fare collection, validation, and processing, including but not limited to... Optional support for ticket vending machines and point-of-sale solutions" but on page #7 it states "The proposed system should improve ridership data collection, validation, and reporting capabilities, including the ability to: Integrate ticket vending machines, point-of-sale devices, and online sales into a centrally monitored fare collection system." Can you please confirm whether or not providing ticket vending machines and point-of-sale devices is required as part of this RFP?	The proposer's solution to the mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection systems utilizing debit card, credit card, prepaid cards, mobile wallet, and in-app payment requirements, as described within the solicitation documents, will require point-of-sale equipment along with possible ticket vending machines and online sales options in the future.
65	What certification or approval is required with GFU/Genfare?	There is no expectation to integrate with or obtain certification from Genfare technology as part of this procurement.
66	Can legacy farebox logic be bypassed?	There is no expectation to integrate with or obtain certification from Genfare technology as part of this procurement.
67	Is real-time farebox connectivity required?	No. There is no expectation to connect to or integrate with onboard farebox equipment in real time as part of this procurement.
68	Must existing Genfare fareboxes remain operational?	Existing Genfare fareboxes may remain in use for cash collection purposes. However, there is no requirement for the proposed solution to integrate with or rely upon Genfare equipment for electronic fare payment.
69	Can fareboxes be replaced or upgraded as part of this project?	The intent of this RFP is not to purchase fareboxes unless that is the proposer's solution to the mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection systems utilizing debit card, credit card, prepaid cards, mobile wallet, and in-app payment described within the solicitation documents.
70	Does this RFP include the procurement of new fareboxes?	The intent of this RFP is not to purchase fareboxes unless that is the proposer's solution to the mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection systems utilizing debit card, credit card, prepaid cards, mobile wallet, and in-app payment described within the solicitation documents.
71	If you will be procuring new fareboxes for this RFP, can you please list the quantities of fareboxes you will purchase for: Porterville, Visalia, Tulare County, Kings Area Rural Transit	The intent of the RFP is to procure a mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection system solution that utilizes debit cards, credit cards, prepaid cards, mobile wallets, and in-app payments, as described in the solicitation documents.
72	If you are procuring new fareboxes, what type of payment features are required to be included on the farebox?	The mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection systems that use debit cards, credit cards, prepaid cards, mobile wallets, and in-app payments are described in the solicitation documents.
73	There is no mention of vaulting or probing items that need to be procured as part of this RFP. Visalia upgraded its vaults and probes to be compatible with Fast Fare fareboxes in 2023, TCRTA did the same in 2024, and Kings Area Rural Transit upgraded its vaults and probes in 2020. Can you please confirm if vaulting or probing items will be purchased as part of this RFP?	The intent of this RFP is not to purchase fareboxes, probing equipment, or vaulting equipment unless that is the proposer's solution to the mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection systems utilizing debit card, credit card, prepaid cards, mobile wallet, and in-app payment described within the solicitation documents.
74	The RFP states that Porterville is leveraging Diamond fareboxes. Are the Genfare Fast Fare fareboxes that Porterville purchased in 2015 and 2018 still available for use?	No.
75	The RFP states that Porterville has an integration between Hanover and the Diamond farebox - "Hanover integration (in process) with Diamond fareboxes." Can you explain what that integration is?	To clarify, the current integration is between Hanover and Tripshot.

76	The RFP states that Visalia Transit has Odyssey fareboxes. Can you confirm that Visalia actually has Fast Fare fareboxes? Visalia has purchased more than 25 Fast Fare fareboxes since 2021.	Visalia transit has both Odyssey (30) and Fast Fare (25) fareboxes.
77	Are we to supply one on-board validator per vehicle (145 validators) or will some vehicles require two validators per vehicle?	One validator per vehicle.
78	Please confirm that integration with existing fare-collection equipment/fareboxes is not required?	Integration with existing fare-collection equipment/fareboxes is not required.
79	It was mentioned in the pre-proposal meeting that agencies intend to use their existing farebox equipment and that, down the line, agencies will want to get riders to get off cash entirely. It was also stated that proposers should demonstrate a myriad of payment options. Can you confirm that cash collection solutions are only optional in this bid? If vendors want to present optional cash-collection solutions, how would you like them presented? For example, could pricing on an optional cash collection solution be estimated (subject to change) since it's not clear which (if any) agencies would want to opt into cash collection solutions?	Cash collection solutions are not required under this solicitation. Agencies intend to continue using their existing farebox equipment for cash collection at this time, and the proposed system is not required to replace or integrate with existing fareboxes. The primary objective of this procurement is to implement an electronic fare payment solution with multiple payment options.  Proposers may present cash-collection solutions strictly as optional enhancements. Any such options shall be clearly identified as optional and priced separately from the base proposal. Optional cash solutions shall not be included in the base cost proposal.
80	Is there any additional cash acceptance equipment to be supplied as part of the scope?	Cash collection solutions are not required under this solicitation. Agencies intend to continue using their existing farebox equipment for cash collection at this time, and the proposed system is not required to replace or integrate with existing fareboxes. The primary objective of this procurement is to implement an electronic fare payment solution with multiple payment options.  Proposers may present cash-collection solutions strictly as optional enhancements. Any such options shall be clearly identified as optional and priced separately from the base proposal. Optional cash solutions shall not be included in the base cost proposal.
81	Are we correct to assume there is a total of 133 buses and 12 vehicles; the total of 145 vehicles?	194.  Please see addendum No. 7 regarding updates to Visalia Transit's fleet size.  Porterville Transit: 14 buses Visalia Transit: 48 buses, 33 cutaways, and 7 vans Tulare County Regional Transit Agency: 54 buses, Kings Area Rural Transit: 26 buses and 12 paratransit vehicles
82	Are we correct to assume there is a total of 133 buses and 12 vehicles; the total of 145 vehicles?	194.  Please see addendum No. 7 regarding updates to Visalia Transit's fleet size.  Porterville Transit: 14 buses Visalia Transit: 48 buses, 33 cutaways, and 7 vans Tulare County Regional Transit Agency: 54 buses, Kings Area Rural Transit: 26 buses and 12 paratransit vehicles
83	Please provide a list of vehicle quantities for each agency for validator pricing totals.	194.  Please see addendum No. 7 regarding updates to Visalia Transit's fleet size.  Porterville Transit: 14 buses Visalia Transit: 48 buses, 33 cutaways, and 7 vans Tulare County Regional Transit Agency: 54 buses, Kings Area Rural Transit: 26 buses and 12 paratransit vehicles
84	Are the Android tablets in the micro and paratransit vehicles for Tulare used for fare payments?	No. The Android tablets used in microtransit and paratransit vehicles for Tulare are utilized for trip management through Via Transportation. Fare payments are not processed through the tablets. Payments are completed either online through the Via mobile application or via cash.
85	How many buses require validator installation?	194.  Please see addendum No. 7 regarding updates to Visalia Transit's fleet size.  Porterville Transit: 14 buses Visalia Transit: 48 buses, 33 cutaways, and 7 vans Tulare County Regional Transit Agency: 54 buses, Kings Area Rural Transit: 26 buses and 12 paratransit vehicles
86	Are the validators to be priced separately on a per-unit basis so each agency can purchase as required?	Yes.
87	Are card unique identifiers shared or duplicated across agencies?	Card unique identifiers shall be systemwide unique and recognized across all participating Agencies. The system must prevent duplication of card IDs and must support agency-level reporting and revenue allocation within a shared platform architecture.
88	How many fare rules are required to support inter-agency transfers?	The solution shall support multiple configurable fare rules, including those necessary to accommodate inter-agency transfers. Proposers shall provide a system capable of supporting a flexible and scalable fare structure, allowing Agencies to define, modify, and implement transfer rules as needed without system limitations.

89	Is TCRTA's intention to have a single Backoffice for all participating agencies, or will each agency procure its own instance of the selected vendor's Backoffice?	Proposers shall submit a detailed pricing proposal that clearly identifies all costs associated with the proposed solution for the entire duration of the contract. Pricing shall include, at a minimum, software, hardware, installation, configuration, training, support, maintenance, upgrades, and any optional features or services. Pricing must be clearly broken out by Agency, identifying all one-time and ongoing costs attributable to each Agency. At a minimum, the Agencies in Tulare County shall have a dedicated back office and Kings Area Rural Transit (KART) shall have a separate dedicated back office. In addition, Proposers shall provide separate pricing for configurations consisting of two (2), three (3), and four (4) back offices, clearly identifying any cost differences associated with each configuration.
90	To ensure final evaluation criteria are properly understood by all proposers, can you provide a score value for the oral interview/demonstration section of the Selection Procedure?	Please see addendum No.7.
91	How should riders manage agency selection within the app?	The method by which riders manage or select Agencies within the mobile application is at the discretion of the Proposer. The proposed solution shall provide a clear, intuitive, and seamless rider experience while supporting appropriate agency-level fare products, reporting, and revenue allocation. Proposers shall describe how their approach ensures riders can easily identify, select, and use the appropriate Agency services within the application.
92	What languages must be supported in the mobile app at launch?	At a minimum, the mobile application shall support English and Spanish at launch. Proposers may identify additional language capabilities available within their solution.
93	How should transfers between agencies be handled within the app interface?	The approach to handling inter-agency transfers within the mobile application interface is at the discretion of the Proposer. The proposed solution shall ensure a seamless and intuitive transfer experience for riders, minimizing confusion and eliminating unnecessary steps. Proposers shall describe how transfers will be presented, validated, and applied within the app to support a smooth rider experience across participating Agencies.
94	Which rider app features are required at launch?	At a minimum, the rider mobile application shall be fully functional at launch and support mobile fare payment for all participating Agencies. The application shall allow riders to create and manage accounts, purchase and store fare products, activate and validate fares, and view transaction history. The Proposer shall be flexible in accommodating Agency-requested features at launch, as mutually agreed during implementation, and shall identify any features that may require phased deployment.
95	Which rider app features may be implemented as phased updates?	At a minimum, the rider mobile application shall be fully functional at launch and support mobile fare payment for all participating Agencies. The application shall allow riders to create and manage accounts, purchase and store fare products, activate and validate fares, and view transaction history. The Proposer shall be flexible in accommodating Agency-requested features at launch, as mutually agreed during implementation, and shall identify any features that may require phased deployment.
96	Are there specific accessibility requirements beyond standard WCAG compliance?	The proposed solution shall be fully accessible and compliant with all applicable federal and state accessibility requirements in effect at the time of implementation. Proposers shall ensure that the mobile application and any associated web interfaces meet current accessibility standards and best practices.
97	Will the mobile ticketing app be provided as a white-label solution branded by each agency, or under one common brand?	The branding and deployment model of the mobile ticketing application is at the discretion of the Proposer. Proposers may propose inclusion within an existing regional or vendor-hosted application, or a white-label solution branded for the participating Agencies. There is no preference for a specific approach, provided the proposed solution supports interoperability across Agencies and delivers a seamless rider experience. Pricing shall be clearly broken out by Agency regardless of the approach proposed.
98	Is the intent to replace the existing Token Transit mobile app?	As stated in the RFP, all agencies participating in this joint procurement are intended to operate under a single, uniform fare payment system.
99	For this new mobile fare app, would the four agencies be open to one, unified, multi-tenant mobile application? Or is each agency looking for its own white-label mobile app?	The branding and deployment model of the mobile ticketing application is at the discretion of the Proposer. Proposers may propose inclusion within an existing regional or vendor-hosted application, or a white-label solution branded for the participating Agencies. There is no preference for a specific approach, provided the proposed solution supports interoperability across Agencies and delivers a seamless rider experience. Pricing shall be clearly broken out by Agency regardless of the approach proposed.
100	Please confirm whether there shall be a single mobile ticketing app?	There is no requirement that there be a single mobile ticketing application. Proposers may propose either a single shared application or separate agency-branded applications. The proposed approach shall support interoperability across participating Agencies and provide a seamless rider experience. Pricing shall be clearly broken out by Agency regardless of the structure proposed.
101	Will the mobile ticketing app be provided as a white-label solution branded by each agency, or under one common brand?	The branding and deployment model of the mobile ticketing application is at the discretion of the Proposer. Proposers may propose inclusion within an existing regional or vendor-hosted application, or a white-label solution branded for the participating Agencies. There is no preference for a specific approach, provided the proposed solution supports interoperability across Agencies and delivers a seamless rider experience. Pricing shall be clearly broken out by Agency regardless of the approach proposed.
102	Is a single shared regional mobile application required?	Proposers may propose either a single regional mobile application or separate agency-branded applications, provided the proposed approach supports interoperability across all participating Agencies and delivers a seamless user experience.
103	Please confirm whether there shall be a single mobile ticketing app?	Proposers may propose either a single regional mobile application or separate agency-branded applications, provided the proposed approach supports interoperability across all participating Agencies and delivers a seamless user experience.
104	Are separate agency-branded mobile applications required?	Proposers may propose either a single regional mobile application or separate agency-branded applications, provided the proposed approach supports interoperability across all participating Agencies and delivers a seamless user experience.
105	Is TCRTA's intention to have a single mobile app for all participating agencies, or will each agency procure its own instance of the selected vendor's mobile application?	The intent is to have a single mobile app for the 3 Tulare County agencies and possibly for Kings Area Rural Transit. There may be 1 to 2 different mobile apps, one for all Tulare County Agencies and one for the Kings Area Rural Transit.
106	Are open-loop EMV payments included in the scope of this procurement?	Open-loop EMV payments are not required under the base scope of this procurement; however, the proposed system shall be capable of supporting open-loop EMV functionality. Proposers shall indicate whether open-loop EMV is included in their base proposal or offered as an optional feature and shall clearly identify any associated costs.
107	Is EMV payment support required at launch?	EMV payment support is not mandated at launch. Proposers shall indicate whether open-loop EMV functionality is available within their solution and whether it can be deployed at launch or would require phased implementation. The selected Proposer shall work collaboratively with the participating Agencies during implementation to determine launch preferences, phasing strategy, and associated timelines and costs.
108	Will EMV payment support be addressed in a future procurement?	EMV payment support is not mandated at launch. Proposers shall indicate whether open-loop EMV functionality is available within their solution and whether it can be deployed at launch or would require phased implementation. The selected Proposer shall work collaboratively with the participating Agencies during implementation to determine launch preferences, phasing strategy, and associated timelines and costs.

109	Who will serve as the Merchant of Record?	<p>The region does not currently intend to establish a single governing authority for fare revenue disbursement. The proposed solution must support multiple back-office configurations. At minimum, the system shall support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate back-office environment for Kings Area Regional Transit; and</li> <li>• Either a centralized back office for the Tulare County agencies or separate back-office environments for individual Tulare County agencies, as determined by those agencies.</li> </ul> <p>The system must be flexible to accommodate both centralized and distributed administrative structures within the unified platform.</p>
110	Please confirm that open-loop payment (cEMV credit/debit cards) to pay for the fare at the on-board validator is a mandatory requirement?	Open-loop EMV payments are not required under the base scope of this procurement; however, the proposed system shall be capable of supporting open-loop EMV functionality (including for on-board validators). Proposers shall indicate whether open-loop EMV is included in their base proposal or offered as an optional feature and shall clearly identify any associated costs.
111	In regard to Optional Features Checklist No. 1 – System & Functional Features, Item #2 Open Loop Payments, please advise on the status of the Open Loop Payments project previously procured by TCRTA through CAL-ITP. Would the proposed OLP solution replace the previously awarded solution?	TCRTA did not procure an Open Loop Payments solution through CAL-ITP. There is no existing CAL-ITP OLP contract in place.
112	Who is the acquirer? Is it the same for all four agencies?	The Agencies have not designated a single acquiring bank. Participating Agencies may elect to use their existing banking relationships or follow the Proposer's recommended acquiring structure. Proposers shall describe the proposed acquiring model, including whether a single acquirer would support all Agencies or whether agency-specific arrangements can be accommodated.
113	Are you looking for both direct on-board cEMV open-loop payment plus also in-app mobile ticket purchase to be validated on-board via NFC or QR?	The proposed solution shall be capable of supporting direct on-board cEMV open-loop payments via contactless bank card tap on a validator. In-app mobile ticket purchases validated via NFC or QR may also be proposed. Proposers shall indicate whether these functionalities are included in the base scope or offered as optional features and identify any associated implementation considerations and costs.
114	Does optional feature selection apply to the entire checklist?	Optional features are included within the evaluation criteria and account for twenty (20) points under "Optional Checklists." As outlined in the RFP, the Proposer's ability to meet, support, and accommodate the identified features will be evaluated. Responses provided in the Capability and Base Scope Matrix issued under Addendum No. 7 will be used to assess overall functionality, completeness, and the strength of the proposal as part of the scoring process.
115	Can optional feature selection be applied per individual feature?	Optional features are included within the evaluation criteria and account for twenty (20) points under "Optional Checklists." As outlined in the RFP, the Proposer's ability to meet, support, and accommodate the identified features will be evaluated. Responses provided in the Capability and Base Scope Matrix issued under Addendum No. 7 will be used to assess overall functionality, completeness, and the strength of the proposal as part of the scoring process. Optional feature scoring will not be applied on a per-individual feature basis, but rather evaluated in the aggregate as part of the overall proposal value.
116	How are optional features evaluated?	Optional features are included within the evaluation criteria and account for twenty (20) points under "Optional Checklists." As outlined in the RFP, the Proposer's ability to meet, support, and accommodate the identified features will be evaluated. Responses provided in the Capability and Base Scope Matrix issued under Addendum No. 7 will be used to assess overall functionality, completeness, and the strength of the proposal as part of the scoring process.
117	Do optional features receive scoring advantages?	Optional features are included within the evaluation criteria and account for twenty (20) points under "Optional Checklists." As outlined in the RFP, the Proposer's ability to meet, support, and accommodate the identified features will be evaluated. Responses provided in the Capability and Base Scope Matrix issued under Addendum No. 7 will be used to assess overall functionality, completeness, and the strength of the proposal as part of the scoring process.
118	TCRTA's scoring criteria include 20 points for "Optional Features identified in the Optional Features Checklists included in Attachment A." Attachment A does not include an Optional Features Checklist; it only includes a line item for "Other Costs." Can you please specify what items should be included in the Other Costs section?	Optional features are included within the evaluation criteria and account for twenty (20) points under "Optional Checklists." As outlined in the RFP, the Proposer's ability to meet, support, and accommodate the identified features will be evaluated. Responses provided in the Capability and Base Scope Matrix issued under Addendum No. 7 will be used to assess overall functionality, completeness, and the strength of the proposal as part of the scoring process.
119	How are student, senior, or special program passes currently issued?	Currently, students and discount-eligible riders present their identifications when boarding. Effectively, they are flash passes. They are recorded by manual entry by the bus operator. This often leads to human error. The Agencies are looking for a creative solution to address student and institutional passes.
120	What types of passes must continue to be supported under the new system?	The proposed solution shall provide a fully functional mobile payment platform and offer flexible fare product configuration capable of supporting the Agencies' fare programs, including regional passes and institutional pass programs. Proposers shall describe how their solution can accommodate these programs and provide adaptable tools to meet participating Agency needs.
121	How are passes validated today across agencies?	Regional passes are currently issued on magnetic stripe cards through Genfare. Riders may use these passes to transfer between TCRTA and Visalia Transit. Validation occurs via existing farebox equipment; however, validation across agencies may occasionally experience inconsistencies or technical issues.
122	Is TCRTA's intention to create a regional set of passes that can be used to board the bus in each of the 4 jurisdictions? Will they be issued as magnetic tickets or smart cards? Please elaborate on the specifics of this regional pass program (if applicable) as much as possible.	<p>TCRTA intends for the proposed system to support regional pass programs that can be used across participating jurisdictions. The specific structure, media type (e.g., mobile, smart card, cEMV, or other), and operational framework of any regional pass program have not been finalized.</p> <p>Proposers shall describe how their solution can support interoperable regional passes across all four jurisdictions and identify available media options, validation methods, and any operational considerations. The Agencies are seeking flexible solutions that can support regional and institutional pass programs under a unified platform.</p>
123	What is the media for current multi-ride passes sold at transit centers and through vending machines (e.g., QR codes, cards, etc.)?	Multi-ride passes are currently issued as magnetic stripe fare cards and sold at transit centers and through fare vending equipment.

124	<p>With respect to the criteria, "accept valid regional T-Pass fare media," can TCRTA please clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Can you confirm if the Agencies are open to the new vendor replacing existing T-Pass cards in circulation?</li> <li>•What is the scope of usage on the T-Pass cards (how many riders do you think are using this mode of payment)?</li> <li>•How are people acquiring T-Pass cards today?</li> <li>•How are people using the T-Pass card to board the bus?</li> <li>•Who currently provides the T-Pass card?</li> <li>•What technology is used by the T-Pass card to scan on the existing farebox (e.g., is it an RFID card)?</li> <li>•Does TCRTA have programming and applicable encryption keys to allow 3rd party vendors to read the cards?</li> </ul>	<p>The regional T-Pass is currently a multi-use magnetic stripe bus pass. As part of this joint procurement, the participating Agencies anticipate moving to a new method for multi-use bus passes. The proposed fare payment system should be capable of accepting, or providing a viable solution to address acceptance of, multi-use fare media from other agencies within the region, if needed. Specific implementation details are not being specified at this time.</p>
125	<p>Is the existing T-Pass regional pass usable across all the agencies in this RFP today? Can you please clarify, given the mix of fare collection solutions, how the T-Pass regional pass works (is validated) at those agencies?</p>	<p>The existing T-Pass regional pass is not usable across all agencies included in this RFP. At this time, the T-Pass is accepted only between TCRTA and Visalia Transit. The T-Pass is a magnetic stripe fare media and is validated using GFI farebox systems at those agencies.</p>
126	<p>Can you please describe if revenue from the existing T-PASS regional passes is shared amongst member agencies and how it is apportioned?</p>	<p>Revenue from existing T-Pass regional passes is shared among the participating agencies in the shared revenue arrangement. Revenue is typically apportioned based on ridership.</p>
127	<p>Will agencies use an existing payment service provider?</p>	<p>The Agencies have not designated or selected a required payment service provider. Proposers shall identify the payment service provider included in their solution, describe the transaction fee structure and settlement process, and identify any associated requirements.</p>
128	<p>Will the vendor manage payment processing?</p>	<p>The Agencies have not designated or selected a required payment service provider. Proposers shall identify the payment service provider included in their solution, describe the transaction fee structure and settlement process, and identify any associated requirements.</p>
129	<p>Do agencies currently pay credit card processing fees?</p>	<p>Current credit card processing arrangements may vary by Agency. For purposes of this procurement, Proposers should clearly outline all credit card processing fees, transaction fees, and any other payment-related costs included in their proposed solution.</p>
130	<p>Should our proposal include the mobile ticketing app pricing per agency or a single price?</p>	<p>Proposers shall submit a detailed pricing proposal that clearly identifies all costs associated with the proposed solution for the entire duration of the contract. Pricing shall include, at a minimum, software, hardware, installation, configuration, training, support, maintenance, upgrades, and any optional features or services. Pricing must be clearly broken out by Agency, identifying all one-time and ongoing costs attributable to each Agency.</p> <p>In addition, Proposers shall provide separate pricing for configurations consisting of two (2), three (3), and four (4) back offices, clearly identifying any cost differences associated with each configuration.</p>
131	<p>Shall we provide and price a single fare-collection platform that supports all four agencies, or shall we provide and price four separate fare-collection platforms? Are the validators to be priced separately on a per-unit basis so each agency can purchase as required?</p>	<p>Proposers shall submit a detailed pricing proposal that clearly identifies all costs associated with the proposed solution for the entire duration of the contract. Pricing shall include, at a minimum, software, hardware, installation, configuration, training, support, maintenance, upgrades, and any optional features or services. Pricing must be clearly broken out by Agency, identifying all one-time and ongoing costs attributable to each Agency.</p> <p>In addition, Proposers shall provide separate pricing for configurations consisting of two (2), three (3), and four (4) back offices, clearly identifying any cost differences associated with each configuration.</p>
132	<p>Shall we provide and price a single fare-collection platform that supports all four agencies, or shall we provide and price four separate fare-collection platforms?</p>	<p>Proposers shall submit a detailed pricing proposal that clearly identifies all costs associated with the proposed solution for the entire duration of the contract. Pricing shall include, at a minimum, software, hardware, installation, configuration, training, support, maintenance, upgrades, and any optional features or services. Pricing must be clearly broken out by Agency, identifying all one-time and ongoing costs attributable to each Agency. At a minimum, the Agencies in Tulare County shall have a dedicated back office and Kings Area Rural Transit (KART) shall have a separate dedicated back office. In addition, Proposers shall provide separate pricing for configurations consisting of two (2), three (3), and four (4) back offices, clearly identifying any cost differences associated with each configuration.</p>
133	<p>Which project components must be firm fixed price?</p>	<p>Proposers may structure pricing as they deem appropriate, clearly identifying which components are included in the base solution and which are optional or configurable. All pricing assumptions shall be clearly stated. Proposals will be evaluated based on overall value to the Agencies, including pricing, functionality, and the ability to meet Agency needs.</p>
134	<p>Which project components may be priced as optional or configurable?</p>	<p>Proposers may structure pricing as they deem appropriate, clearly identifying which components are included in the base solution and which are optional or configurable. All pricing assumptions shall be clearly stated. Proposals will be evaluated based on overall value to the Agencies, including pricing, functionality, and the ability to meet Agency needs.</p>
135	<p>How should pricing scale for additional vehicles?</p>	<p>Proposers shall clearly identify pricing on a per-vehicle basis to allow the Agencies to add vehicles as needed. Any volume pricing or tiered pricing structures shall be clearly described.</p>
136	<p>How should pricing scale for new agencies joining later?</p>	<p>Expansion to additional agencies is not defined at this time. Any future expansion structure would be discussed and negotiated at that time.</p>
137	<p>Are agencies seeking price locks for future expansion?</p>	<p>Price locks for future expansion are not being required at this time. Future expansion terms, if applicable, would be addressed through negotiation.</p>
138	<p>Is a technology refresh expected during the contract term?</p>	<p>No.</p>
139	<p>Is there a projected fleet growth percentage for pricing future expansion?</p>	<p>Proposers shall clearly identify pricing on a per-vehicle basis to allow the Agencies to add vehicles as needed. Any volume pricing or tiered pricing structures shall be clearly described.</p>
140	<p>What total project budget or budget range has been allocated?</p>	<p>The Agencies have not established a fixed total project budget or budget range for this procurement. Proposals will be evaluated based on overall value, including pricing, functionality, and the Proposer's ability to meet the Agencies' needs.</p>
141	<p>What pricing assumptions should be used for future fleet expansion?</p>	<p>Proposers shall clearly identify pricing on a per-vehicle basis to allow the Agencies to add vehicles as needed. Any volume pricing or tiered pricing structures shall be clearly described.</p>

142	In the Pricing Schedule, you mention that "Pricing shall be provided by the individual Agency and in total." Can you confirm that we need to provide an individual pricing schedule for each agency - Porterville, TCRTA, City of Visalia, and Kings Area Rural Transit? Or do we need to provide 1 pricing sheet that includes the total project cost?	The proposer shall submit individual pricing for each agency, along with a total project cost that consolidates the individual agency line-item prices.
143	Do TCRTA + Agencies want pricing per agency (Porterville, Visalia Transit, TCRTA, and KART), or should vendors treat pricing as though the regional agencies are one entity? This is particularly important for understanding how to price installation services. For example, could the region coordinate installation across all agencies at once, or should we expect installation to happen on a per-agency basis?	Proposers shall provide pricing clearly broken out by Agency, including Porterville Transit, Visalia Transit, Tulare County Regional Transit Agency, and Kings Area Rural Transit, consistent with the detailed pricing requirements set forth in the RFP. All one-time and ongoing costs, including installation, must be identifiable per Agency.  The Agencies prefer a phased rollout by Agency. Installation should be assumed to occur on a per-Agency basis. Proposers shall clearly describe their installation approach and reflect any coordination efficiencies within their per-Agency pricing.
144	In the Pricing Schedule, you mention that "Pricing shall be provided by the individual Agency and in total." Can you confirm that we need to provide an individual pricing schedule for each agency - Porterville, TCRTA, City of Visalia, and Kings Area Rural Transit? Or do we need to provide 1 pricing sheet that includes the total project cost?	The proposer shall submit individual pricing for each agency, along with a total project cost that consolidates the individual agency line-item prices.
145	4. There is no mention of vaulting or probing items that need to be procured as part of this RFP. Visalia upgraded its vaults and probes to be compatible with Fast Fare fareboxes in 2023, TCRTA did the same in 2024, and Kings Area Rural Transit upgraded its vaults and probes in 2020. Can you please confirm if vaulting or probing items will be purchased as part of this RFP? If so, can you please list the quantities of the number of individual vaults and probes you will purchase for: a. Porterville b. Visalia c. Tulare County d. Kings Area Rural Transit	The intent of this RFP is not to purchase fareboxes, probing equipment, or vaulting equipment unless that is the proposer's solution to the mobile ticketing and contactless fare collection systems utilizing debit card, credit card, prepaid cards, mobile wallet, and in-app payment described within the solicitation documents.
146	Are processing fees passed to riders?	Current credit card processing arrangements may vary by Agency. For purposes of this procurement, Proposers should clearly outline all credit card processing fees, transaction fees, and any other payment-related costs included in their proposed solution.
147	Are agencies interested in passing transaction fees to riders for mobile or online purchases?	The Agencies have not made a determination regarding passing transaction fees to riders. Proposers shall identify whether their solution allows transaction fees to be absorbed by the Agency or passed through to riders and clearly describe any associated cost implications.
148	What constitutes system acceptance?	Acceptance shall occur upon successful completion of the forty-five (45) day Testing and Acceptance Period and written confirmation by the Agencies that the equipment, software, materials, and services conform to the requirements set forth in the Scope of Work. Acceptance is contingent upon delivery of all required documentation and contract deliverables.
149	Is there a tentative desired project delivery date for start and go-live?	The Agencies prefer a phased rollout by Agency. While no single fixed go-live date has been established, implementation is expected to proceed promptly following the anticipated award timeline identified in Addendum No. 6. Proposers shall describe their proposed implementation schedule and approach to phased deployment to support an efficient and timely go-live.
150	Is a phased agency rollout acceptable?	A phased rollout is preferred.
151	Is a phased agency rollout preferred?	A phased rollout is preferred.
152	How long must legacy systems remain active in parallel?	Legacy systems shall remain operational in parallel as needed to ensure service continuity, and at a minimum through completion of the applicable warranty period for newly deployed equipment. Proposers shall describe their recommended transition approach and any considerations for phased deployment or sunset of legacy systems.
153	Who controls vehicle access and installation scheduling?	Vehicle access and installation scheduling will be coordinated by the Agency in collaboration with the operating contractor. The selected Proposer shall work with the Agency and operator to develop and adhere to an agreed-upon installation schedule that minimizes service disruption.
154	Is the implementation date contingent on grant approval?	Implementation is not strictly contingent on a single grant approval. A phased rollout by Agency is preferred and anticipated. Some Agencies have secured funding and may be able to proceed earlier, while others may initiate implementation based on funding availability.
155	Will agencies consider adding a second round of written inquiries?	No.
156	Should demonstrations include all agencies?	Demonstrations do not need to be tailored to each individual Agency. A single demonstration representing the proposed solution is acceptable, provided it adequately reflects the system's capability to support all participating Agencies.
157	<b>Should demonstrations focus on a single representative agency?</b>	Demonstrations do not need to be tailored to each individual Agency. A single demonstration representing the proposed solution is acceptable, provided it adequately reflects the system's capability to support all participating Agencies.
158	What is the duration of this contract? The requested warranty for several items is 3 years, but there is no other mention of when the contract will expire.	See addendum No. 4.
159	What is the contract length for the submitted proposals?	See addendum No. 4.
160	Should a redacted proposal be submitted along with the full proposal?	Yes.
161	What information is required to be redacted?	Please refer to Public Notice Request for Proposals Electronic Fare Payment System included at the beginning of the RFP.

162	Is the redacted proposal due on the same date as the full proposal?	Yes.
163	Should redacted copies be submitted digitally?	Yes.
164	Should redacted copies be submitted as physical documents?	Redacted copies must be submitted along with the official submission.
165	We are preparing our bid submission and would appreciate clarification on the number of references required.	There is no specified minimum number of references required. However, references will be considered as part of the evaluation process and may be used to assess the Proposer's experience, past performance, and overall qualifications. Proposers are encouraged to provide sufficient references to adequately support their proposal.
166	What reporting support is required for FTA, NTD, and audits?	The proposed system shall provide reporting capabilities sufficient to support federal, state, and local compliance, oversight, and audit requirements, including but not limited to FTA reporting, National Transit Database (NTD) reporting, revenue reconciliation, financial reporting, fare revenue allocation by Agency and service type, ridership and unlinked passenger trip reporting, reduced fare and fare category tracking, payment type reporting, transfers and fare product usage, adjustments and refunds, and full audit trail documentation. The system shall maintain transaction-level detail adequate to support internal and external audits and regulatory reviews and shall allow data export in standard formats. Reporting functionality shall not be limited to the items listed above and shall provide flexibility to generate custom reports as required by regulatory agencies, funding partners, or Agency management.
167	To support the required reporting interoperability with existing fareboxes, can the agencies please confirm that they have secured access to that data through licensing and commercial agreements with the incumbent provider(s)? Can the agencies share the details of the sharing agreement - the method of sharing such as file or API, and the format of the data or API structure?	Direct integration with existing farebox systems is not required under this procurement. However, the proposed solution must provide a method to capture and report cash fare activity, as certain fareboxes may continue to be used solely for cash collection. Proposers shall describe how cash transactions will be recorded and incorporated into reporting.
168	Please describe how data generated by the currently installed collection equipment will be accessed and integrated. Specifically, are the existing equipment suppliers willing and able to provide access to this data, and under what conditions?	Direct integration with existing farebox systems is not required under this procurement. However, the proposed solution must provide a method to capture and report cash fare activity, as certain fareboxes may continue to be used solely for cash collection. Proposers shall describe how cash transactions will be recorded and incorporated into reporting.
169	Which reports are considered mission-critical?	There is no predefined list of required reports; however, at a minimum, the system must provide transaction-level data, including fare paid, payment location, route, and the Agency to which the ride is attributed. The system shall also support ridership reporting and provide data necessary to meet FTA reporting requirements. The scope, flexibility, and clarity of reporting capabilities described by the Proposer will be considered in evaluating the overall value of the proposal.
170	Which reports are considered "nice to have"?	There is no predefined list of required reports; however, at a minimum, the system must provide transaction-level data, including fare paid, payment location, route, and the Agency to which the ride is attributed. The system shall also support ridership reporting and provide data necessary to meet FTA reporting requirements. The scope, flexibility, and clarity of reporting capabilities described by the Proposer will be considered in evaluating the overall value of the proposal.
171	Are agencies expecting custom report development after award?	Agencies expect the system to provide robust standard reporting capabilities at launch. The solution should support both regionally standardized reports and agency-specific reporting as needed. The scope and flexibility of reporting capabilities, including the ability to configure or generate customized reports, will be evaluated as part of the overall proposal.
172	Should reports be standardized across the region?	Agencies expect the system to provide robust standard reporting capabilities at launch. The solution should support both regionally standardized reports and agency-specific reporting as needed. The scope and flexibility of reporting capabilities, including the ability to configure or generate customized reports, will be evaluated as part of the overall proposal.
173	Should reports be agency-specific?	Yes. Agencies expect the system to provide robust standard reporting capabilities at launch. The solution should support both regionally standardized reports and agency-specific reporting as needed. The scope and flexibility of reporting capabilities, including the ability to configure or generate customized reports, will be evaluated as part of the overall proposal.
174	Who is responsible for validating financial reports?	The Agencies have not finalized whether financial report validation will be centralized or handled separately by participating Agencies. The proposed system shall be capable of supporting at least two back offices, one for Kings Area Rural Transit and one for the Agencies in Tulare County, and must also be capable of accommodating additional Tulare County back offices if needed. Proposers shall describe how their solution supports multi agency financial validation and reporting structures.
175	Will cooperative purchasing contracts be utilized?	No.
176	Integrate ridership data with the Route Match suite of software. What data is needed? Are vendors providing an integration/API into the Route Match system?	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
177	Validate driver log-on and route/run entries against the Route Match database. Is this referring to the need for single-on integration with Route match?	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
178	What is meant with: Integrate ridership data with the RouteMatch suite of software	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
179	Integrate ridership data with the Route Match suite of software. What data is needed? Are vendors providing an integration/API into the Route match system?	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
180	Validate driver log-on and route/run entries against the Route Match database. Is this referring to the need for single-on integration with Route match?	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
181	Validate driver log-on and route/run entries against the RouteMatch database. Should this happen in real time or later in reporting?	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
182	What is meant with: Integrate ridership data with the RouteMatch suite of software	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.

183	Does RouteMatch currently provide an open API for ridership integration?	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
184	Will the contractor be responsible for developing a custom RouteMatch interface?	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
185	Can agencies provide API specifications for RouteMatch integration?	Please see addendum No.7 regarding RouteMatch and Trip Planning Software.
186	Does each agency have installed on-board routers?	Yes.
187	Do KART and Porterville have networking routers and open ports available on the vehicles for data connectivity?	Yes.
188	Please confirm that the provided validators will connect to each agency's onboard routers. Therefore, communication fees should not be included.	Validators are not required to connect to each Agency's onboard routers. Proposers may propose their own connectivity approach, including alternative communication solutions. Proposers shall clearly describe their proposed architecture and identify any associated communication fees. The proposed approach and overall value to the Agencies will be evaluated as part of the proposal.
189	How many LAN or WAN ports are available on existing onboard routers?	Information regarding existing onboard routers and vehicle network specifications has been provided in the RFP. Proposers shall review the provided materials and base their proposals accordingly. Any additional technical coordination will occur during implementation with the selected Proposer.
190	What physical interfaces are available on existing vehicle networks?	Information regarding existing onboard routers and vehicle network specifications has been provided in the RFP. Proposers shall review the provided materials and base their proposals accordingly. Any additional technical coordination will occur during implementation with the selected Proposer.
191	What logical interfaces are available on existing vehicle networks?	Information regarding existing onboard routers and vehicle network specifications has been provided in the RFP. Proposers shall review the provided materials and base their proposals accordingly. Any additional technical coordination will occur during implementation with the selected Proposer.
192	Should the solution utilize existing onboard routers?	Validators are not required to connect to each Agency's onboard routers. Proposers may propose their own connectivity approach, including alternative communication solutions. Proposers shall clearly describe their proposed architecture and identify any associated communication fees. The proposed approach and overall value to the Agencies will be evaluated as part of the proposal.
193	Are proposers allowed to use Cradlepoint routers?	Yes.
194	Are proposers allowed to use Digi or Meraki routers?	Yes.
195	Is the vendor required to provide dedicated cellular hardware?	Proposers may propose their own connectivity approach, including alternative communication solutions. Proposers shall clearly describe their proposed architecture and identify any associated communication fees. The proposed approach and overall value to the Agencies will be evaluated as part of the proposal.
196	Should AFC equipment use a dedicated mobile data plan?	Proposers may propose their own connectivity approach, including alternative communication solutions. Proposers shall clearly describe their proposed architecture and identify any associated communication fees. The proposed approach and overall value to the Agencies will be evaluated as part of the proposal.
197	Can AFC equipment use the existing onboard vehicle network?	Yes.
198	Are customer references required?	Yes.
199	How many customer references are required?	There is no specified minimum number of references required. However, references will be considered as part of the evaluation process and may be used to assess the Proposer's experience, past performance, and overall qualifications. Proposers are encouraged to provide sufficient references to adequately support their proposal.
200	Are international transit agency references acceptable?	Yes.
201	Are vendors headquartered outside the U.S. eligible to submit proposals?	Vendors headquartered outside the United States are eligible to submit proposals, provided they meet all applicable federal, state, and local requirements and are legally authorized to conduct business in the United States.
202	TCRTA's scoring criteria include 20 points for "Optional Features identified in the Optional Features Checklists included in Attachment A." Attachment A does not include an Optional Features Checklist; it only includes a line item for "Other Costs." Can you please specify what items should be included in the Other Costs section?	See addendum No. 7.
203	Can project experience be submitted separately to meet different evaluation criteria?	Proposers may reference different project experiences to address various evaluation criteria. All project experience will be evaluated based on the Proposer's demonstrated ability to meet the Agencies' needs and successfully deliver the proposed solution.
204	Are narrative templates required beyond the bid form?	No additional narrative templates are required beyond the forms and submission requirements identified in the RFP and associated addenda. Proposers may structure their narrative responses as they deem appropriate, provided all required information is clearly addressed.
205	Is email submission required in addition to hard copy delivery?	Proposers must submit, in a sealed package, one (1) original and one (1) electronic copy on a flash drive of all materials required for acceptance of their Proposal to:  Tulare County Regional Transit Agency Attn: Derek Winning, Executive Director 200 E. Center, Visalia, CA 93291
206	Would electronic-only submissions be accepted?	Proposers must submit, in a sealed package, one (1) original and one (1) electronic copy on a flash drive of all materials required for acceptance of their Proposal to:  Tulare County Regional Transit Agency Attn: Derek Winning, Executive Director 200 E. Center, Visalia, CA 93291
207	Please confirm if it's acceptable for a Proposer to electronically sign the proposal documents using a tool such as DocuSign.	Yes.
208	Is there a page limit to proposals?	No.

209	Could you please provide the current Plan Holders List and the sign-in sheet from the pre-proposal meeting?	The Agency does not maintain a formal Plan Holders List for this solicitation. In addition, no official sign-in sheet was maintained for the pre-proposal meeting.
210	Are the billing terms listed in the RFP negotiable?	No.
211	Are ticket vending machines currently in operation?	No.
212	On page #6, it states "The AFC system shall address all phases of fare collection, validation, and processing, including but not limited to... Optional support for ticket vending machines and point-of-sale solutions" but on page #7 it states "The proposed system should improve ridership data collection, validation, and reporting capabilities, including the ability to: Integrate ticket vending machines, point-of-sale devices, and online sales into a centrally monitored fare collection system." Can you please confirm whether or not providing ticket vending machines and point-of-sale devices is required as part of this RFP?	The Agencies do not currently operate ticket vending machines. The proposed system shall be capable of integrating with ticket vending machines in order to collect and record transaction data if such devices are implemented in the future. TVM integration is not a mandatory requirement at this time, and Proposers are not required to supply TVMs as part of the base scope, but may propose them as an optional component and clearly identify any associated assumptions and costs.
213	The RFP states we are to integrate ticket vending machines, point-of-sale devices, and online sales into a centrally monitored fare-collection system. Please elaborate on the types of vending machines and point-of-sale devices currently used by each agency. Are APIs available?	The Agencies do not currently operate ticket vending machines. The proposed system shall be capable of integrating with ticket vending machines in order to collect and record transaction data if such devices are implemented in the future. TVM integration is not a mandatory requirement at this time, and Proposers are not required to supply TVMs as part of the base scope, but may propose them as an optional component and clearly identify any associated assumptions and costs.
214	The RFP references the expectation that the proposed solution be capable of integrating with ticket vending machines. Please confirm whether TVM integration is a mandatory requirement. If so, could the Agency provide details regarding the specific TVM models, manufacturers, communication protocols, and any available technical documentation to support accurate scoping of this integration? Or, is it the desire that the proposer supply TVMs as part of the proposal, and if so, how many?	The Agencies do not currently operate ticket vending machines. The proposed system shall be capable of integrating with ticket vending machines in order to collect and record transaction data if such devices are implemented in the future. TVM integration is not a mandatory requirement at this time, and Proposers are not required to supply TVMs as part of the base scope, but may propose them as an optional component and clearly identify any associated assumptions and costs.
215	Are Ticket or fare payment machines part of the scope? If so, would these machines be unattended?	The Agencies do not currently operate ticket vending machines. The proposed system shall be capable of integrating with ticket vending machines in order to collect and record transaction data if such devices are implemented in the future. TVM integration is not a mandatory requirement at this time, and Proposers are not required to supply TVMs as part of the base scope, but may propose them as an optional component and clearly identify any associated assumptions and costs.
216	How many validators or readers are required, including spare units?	Fleet counts are provided in Addendum No. 7 for planning purposes. Proposers shall provide pricing on a per-unit basis for validators or readers based on the fleet sizes identified. The Agencies will determine final quantities, including any spare units, during contract negotiations. Proposers may recommend a spare quantity or ratio based on industry best practices and shall clearly identify associated per-unit pricing.
217	Are we to supply one on-board validator per vehicle (145 validators) or will some vehicles require two validators per vehicle?	194.  Please see addendum No. 7 regarding updated to Visalia Transit's fleet size.  Porterville Transit: 14 buses Visalia Transit: 48 buses, 33 cutaways, and 7 vans Tulare County Regional Transit Agency: 54 buses, Kings Area Rural Transit: 26 buses and 12 paratransit vehicles
218	How many validators will be installed per bus?	One.
219	How many validators will be installed per paratransit vehicle?	One.
220	Is the proposer required to supply onboard validators?	Yes. Onboard validators are required as part of the base scope of this procurement and shall be included in the proposal.
221	Are validators required as part of AFC implementation?	Yes. Onboard validators are required as part of the base scope of this procurement and shall be included in the proposal.
222	What triggers re-pricing versus use of contractual options?	Re-pricing or the use of contractual options will depend on the nature and scope of the requested change. Modifications within the defined scope and contract structure may be addressed through established contractual options. Material changes to scope, functionality, or deployment may require negotiation and potential re-pricing in accordance with applicable procurement requirements.