

Procurement Department

Sara Rowe, NIGP-CPP, Procurement Agent
410-638-4082 • Sara.Rowe@hcps.org

ADDENDUM #2

IFB #26-SR-014

Bus Routing, Fleet Management, GPS, and School Planning

TO: ALL OFFERORS
FROM: Sara Rowe, NIGP-CPP, Procurement Agent
DATE: June 2, 2026

This Addendum is issued in response to prospective offeror's inquiries and to add/clarify verbiage in the RFP document.

GENERAL RFP CLARIFICATIONS:

1. **QUESTION:** I'm accessing the link on emma.maryland.gov for 26-SR-014, and all that's downloading is the cover page. Where can I find the complete RFP for review?

ANSWER: Bidders may obtain the Solicitation Documents by downloading the information at our website:
www.hcps.org/departments/BusinessServices/purchasing.aspx. Bidders shall continue to check the HCPS website for possible addenda to the bid(s) prior to the bid opening date.

2. **DELETE:** Page 23

5.1 HCPS requires that participating respondents have been in the business for at least ten (10) years consulting on retirement plans. All respondents **SHALL SUBMIT** the number of years providing this type of service under the current business name and contact name on company letterhead. Respondent(s) who cannot demonstrate to the satisfaction of HCPS that they have had similar experiences or fail to provide this documentation may deem your proposal non-responsive.

ADD: Page 23

5.1 HCPS requires that participating respondents have been in the business for at least seven (7) years providing these services. All respondents **SHALL SUBMIT** the number of years providing this type of service under the current business name and

contact name on company letterhead. Respondent(s) who cannot demonstrate to the satisfaction of HCPS that they have had similar experiences or fail to provide this documentation may deem your proposal non-responsive.

3. **DELETE**: Page 23

5.2 Respondents shall acknowledge their responsibilities as a fiduciary under Public Act 314 of 1965, as amended. The Retirement Plan Consultant must be a registered investment advisor under the Investment Advisors Act of 1940. Failure to provide this documentation may deem your proposal non-responsive.

4. **DELETE**: Page 23

5.3 Respondents shall submit biographic profiles on the individual(s) who will be assigned to this contract. The Lead Relationship Manager must have at least ten (10) years of experience in providing the services requested in this RFP and industry. Failure to provide this requirement may deem your proposal non-responsive.

ADD: Page 23

5.3 Respondents shall submit biographic profiles on the individual(s) who will be assigned to this contract. The Lead Relationship Manager must have at least seven (7) years of experience in providing the services requested in this RFP and industry. Failure to provide this requirement may deem your proposal non-responsive.

5. **QUESTION**: Sections 5.1 and 5.2 reference retirement plan consulting, fiduciary responsibility, Public Act 314 of 1965, and registered investment advisor documentation. Since this RFP is for Bus Routing, Fleet Management, GPS, and School Planning Solutions, can HCPS confirm whether these requirements were included in error and provide the correct respondent requirements?

ANSWER: See Addendum 2 Items 2, 3, and 4.

6. **QUESTION**: Section 5.3 states the Lead Relationship Manager must have at least ten years of experience, while Tab 2 states seven years. Can HCPS confirm the correct minimum experience requirement?

ANSWER: See Addendum 2 Items 2, 3, and 4.

7. **QUESTION**: The schedule lists the question deadline as May 19, 2036, in one location, while the cover page indicates May 19, 2026. Can HCPS confirm the correct question deadline?

ANSWER: May 19, 2026

8. **QUESTION**: Can HCPS confirm the anticipated Notice to Proceed date and whether implementation is expected to begin before January 1, 2027, contract start date?

ANSWER: Please see page 22, Section 4, Schedule of Activities for schedule of events. Dates are proposed and subject to change.

9. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS have a required production go-live date, such as the start of the 2027–2028 school year, summer routing period, or another target date?

ANSWER: Our target date for some solutions to go live is January 2027.

10. **QUESTION:** Could HCPS also please confirm whether there is an established budget, estimated budget range, or anticipated funding allocation for this RFP?

ANSWER: This information is not available at this time.

11. **QUESTION:** Would interviews/presentations be held in person or virtually?

ANSWER: Interviews/Presentations are typically held virtually; however, HCPS reserves the right to request presentations in person.

12. **QUESTION:** Section 8.1 sets an initial contract term of two years beginning approximately January 1, 2027. Given the June 2026 proposal deadline and the evaluation timeline, is the January 2027 start date firm, or is there flexibility if implementation requires more time?

ANSWER: HCPS anticipates a phased implementation approach, with priority given to Financial and Routing/GPS modules.

13. **QUESTION:** With a January 1, 2027, contract start, what is HCPS's expected go-live date for each module (routing, GPS, parent app, financial)? Is a phased rollout acceptable?

ANSWER: HCPS anticipates a phased implementation approach, with priority given to Financial and Routing/GPS modules.

14. **QUESTION:** Section 6 (Special Conditions) states this is an IDIQ contract with services pending allocation of funds from USDE and MSDE. Can HCPS clarify which specific funding sources are anticipated, and whether there is a risk that funding may not be appropriated in time for the January 2027 start?

ANSWER: Funding may come from various sources. HCPS is not aware of any current risks to funding available but reserves this right based on any unexpected factors.

15. **QUESTION:** Section 7.7 reserves the right to make multiple awards. Under what circumstances would HCPS consider splitting the award among multiple vendors (e.g., routing to one vendor, GPS to another), and should vendors price each module independently to accommodate this possibility?

ANSWER: Award will be made in accordance with the best interest of Harford County Public Schools. Pricing should match the cost proposal format.

16. **QUESTION:** Section 13.5 requests an additional redacted copy if confidential materials are submitted. Should the redacted copy be submitted in the same email as the technical proposal, or in a separate third email?

ANSWER: Offerors may submit in the same email or separate. Redacted document and original document must be clearly marked.

17. **QUESTION:** Will HCPS share scoring results or evaluator comments with vendors who request a debriefing, as referenced in Section 7 of the Instructions to Offerors?

ANSWER: Offerors request a debriefing will have the opportunity to see feedback from the RFP committee as presented by a buyer familiar with the solicitation.

18. **QUESTION:** If HCPS exercises its right to conduct presentations (Section 17), will all vendors above a technical score threshold be invited, or only the top-ranked vendor?

ANSWER: Proposals will be shortlisted based on Technical Scores. Presentations are expected to be requested from the shortlisted proposals.

19. **QUESTION:** Cost proposal lists GPS for item #2. Is this intended for both a GPS device, and tablet solution?

ANSWER: Yes

20. **QUESTION:** Lead relationship manager – Submittal requirements require 7 years of industry experience. Respondent requirements state 10 years of experience. Which is correct?

ANSWER: See Addendum 2 Items 2, 3, and 4.

21. **QUESTION:** Are you willing to accept a proposal that does not include routing or school planning components?

If yes, will you consider reuse of existing hardware and/or new hardware?

ANSWER: No.

22. **QUESTION:** Section 7.7 reserves the right to make multiple awards. Is HCPS open to a best-of-breed award (e.g., one vendor for Routing/Planning, another for GPS/Parent App, another for Financial Management), or is a single-vendor end-to-end solution preferred?

ANSWER: HCPS intends to award in accordance with Pag 24, Section 7, Award. HCPS prefers to award one supplier, however, may make multiple awards based on the proposals received and what is in the best interest of HCPS.

23. **QUESTION:** The Cost Proposal form (Attachment I) requests pricing in three buckets – Routing/Fleet Management, GPS, and School Planning. Should Parent Communication (3.5) and Financial Management (3.4) be priced as line items within those buckets, or as additional options?

ANSWER: They should be priced within those buckets, not as add on prices.

24. **QUESTION:** Section 5.4 requires vendors to be in “Good Standing” with the State Department of Assessment and Taxation. Is it permissible for vendors to not have status

with this department before submitting a proposal? Will all vendors need to at least register with this department in advance of submitting a proposal for their proposals to be deemed responsive?

ANSWER: Vendors should be in “Good Standing” prior to submitting their proposal. HCPS reserves the right to make investigations deemed necessary to determine vendor state with the State Department of Assessment and Taxation.

BUS ROUTING AND FLEET MANAGEMENT:

25. **QUESTION:** What fleet maintenance solutions are in use by the district?

ANSWER: Our Fleet Maintenance Solution is through a program provided by Harford County Government.

26. **QUESTION:** Would fleet maintenance software be needed for Contractor-operated vehicles or in-house fleet vehicles only?

ANSWER: In-house fleet vehicles only

27. **QUESTION:** Could HCPS consider a limited support slice that sits beside the primary solution vendor and focuses on routing data readiness, GPS validation samples, acceptance tests, issue tracking, and cutover evidence?

The support slice would produce:

- route/stop/vehicle/school/schedule data readiness checklist
- duplicate, missing-value, invalid-coordinate, and field-ownership checks
- acceptance test scenarios for bell schedules, route exceptions, service changes, parent-facing outputs, reporting, and handoff criteria
- GPS validation sample plan for device-to-route matching, stale signals, vehicle IDs, timing variance, and route-completion evidence
- issue register with severity, evidence, likely owner, remediation status, retest result, and launch-risk notes
-
- Boundary: no student names, home addresses, live route assignments, GPS logs, credentials, or internal exports should be sent by email. A sample or anonymized data path is enough to shape the checklist.
- If this type of limited support is eligible, should it be submitted directly through the formal RFP path, routed through the selected vendor, or treated only as an informational procurement question?

ANSWER: HCPS is open to reviewing all proposals from responsive and responsible offerors for the services contained in the RFP however all proposals must include school routing or planning solutions.

28. **QUESTION:** The RFP references compatibility with the ArcGIS platform (Section 3.1.1). Can HCPS clarify which specific ArcGIS products and version(s) are currently in use?

ANSWER: Harford County Government currently uses ArcGIS enterprise Services 11.4. We should match this.

29. **QUESTION:** For ArcGIS compatibility, does HCPS require native Esri/ArcGIS integration, or is import/export compatibility with Esri-supported formats acceptable?

ANSWER: This information is unavailable at this time.

30. **QUESTION:** What are the required file formats, update frequency, and process for importing Harford County Government centerline and address datasets into the routing solution?

ANSWER: All formats native to ArcGIS and Open Source such as QGIS. Vector and Raster

31. **QUESTION:** Should the proposed system support both general education and special education routing in the same platform?

ANSWER: Yes

32. **QUESTION:** What special education routing rules, student accommodations, confidentiality requirements, and rider constraints must the system support?

ANSWER: This information changes on a case-by-case basis. HCPS attempts to get as close to a students home as possible for our special education students.

33. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS require automated route optimization capabilities, or is route creation, editing, analysis, and management sufficient?

ANSWER: We prefer all of the above.

34. **QUESTION:** What routing constraints should be considered mandatory, including bell times, bus capacity, ride time limits, walk distances, grade-level rules, hazardous roads, turn restrictions, vehicle type restrictions, and one-way streets?

ANSWER: One way street, no left turns onto state roads over 40 mph, non-service areas for schools, etc.

35. **QUESTION:** Can HCPS provide the current number of schools, routes, bus stops, runs, students transported, contractors, drivers, attendants, and daily route miles for sizing and pricing purposes?

ANSWER:

Approximately 55 in-county schools and several out-of-county non-public schools
410 contractor buses and 116 county-owned special needs buses

27 school bus contractors

Currently, approximately 600 certified school bus drivers and attendants

of bus stops changes daily

Approximate Daily Route Mileage Totals for Contractors – 30,000 miles

Approximate Daily Hours by Contractors – 2,325 hours

Approximate Daily Route Mileage Totals for County-owned Vehicles – 7,700 miles
Approximate Daily Hours by County-Owned Vehicles – 812 hours

36. **QUESTION:** Section 3.1.4 states that centerline and address updates must be manageable in-house without vendor intervention. Does HCPS expect the vendor to provide initial training on this process, and is there a frequency expectation for how often these updates are applied?

ANSWER: Yes, initial training should be provided along with customer service when needed.

37. **QUESTION:** Section 3.1.5 references converting data from 'existing or legacy systems.' Beyond Transfinder, are there any other legacy systems or databases from which data will need to be migrated (e.g., student information, contractor records, driver history)?

ANSWER: Yes, contractor records, driver and attendant data, bus information, etc.

38. **QUESTION:** Can HCPS provide a sample data export from Transfinder so vendors can assess the complexity of the data migration?

ANSWER: This information is not available.

39. **QUESTION:** Section 3.1.7 references student bus assignment automation. Can HCPS describe the current manual exception process in more detail, including the approximate volume of manual exceptions processed per year?

ANSWER: This number is unknown. Exceptions happens everyday but the number of times per day varies greatly.

40. **QUESTION:** Section 3.1.10 references 'what-if' scenario planning that does not impact real-time data. Can HCPS clarify whether these scenarios need to be savable, shareable among users, or exportable to reports.

ANSWER: Yes, they need to be savable, sharable, and exportable to reports.

41. **QUESTION:** What GIS data layers does HCPS currently use in school planning (e.g., census data, parcel data, enrollment projections), and will HCPS provide these layers to the vendor?

ANSWER: Parcel data, center line data, and aerial photography.

42. **QUESTION:** Does the school have a county GIS department we can work with to determine map source?

Contact Name:
Phone Number:

ANSWER: This information will be provided to the awarded offeror(s) post award.

43. **QUESTION:** In how many separate locations will staff be located during training?

ANSWER: Training plans will be established with the awarded offeror(s) post award.

44. **QUESTION:** Which routing solution is currently in use? Routefinder Pro, or Plus?

ANSWER: RouteFinder Plus

45. **QUESTION:** Does the district intend to partner with a new routing provider?

ANSWER: HCPS is seeking proposals from Qualified Offeror for Bus Routing, Fleet Management, GPS, and School Planning to be utilized on its fleet of buses.

46. **QUESTION:** Has the district spoken with other vendors, or seen demos from other vendors in the last two years, prior to the release of this RFP? Please list which vendors the district has been in contact with, and/or seen a demonstration with.

ANSWER: This information is not available.

47. **QUESTION:** Section 3.1.1 requires ArcGIS compatibility. What version of ArcGIS Enterprise/Online does HCPS use, and is the expectation read-only consumption of HCPS basemaps or full read/write integration? Is it permissible for a vendor to use Google Maps or some other map source other than ArcGIS?

ANSWER: HCPS would want to use whatever provides the most up to date information.

TABLETS, GPS, AND HARDWARE:

48. **QUESTION:** Can HCPS confirm whether vendors are required to provide new in-bus GPS hardware/tablets, mounts, installation, and related connectivity costs as part of the GPS solution, or whether vendors may reuse HCPS's existing Synovia/CalAmp tablet hardware if compatible? If reuse is allowed, please provide the current hardware inventory, make/model, quantity, condition, and any expected replacement requirements.

ANSWER: It should not be assumed that HCPS will utilize the current hardware that is on the buses.

49. **QUESTION:** Should vendors propose new GPS hardware/tablets, reuse existing Synovia/CalAmp hardware, or provide both options?

ANSWER: Please provide new hardware/tablets.

50. **QUESTION:** Who will be responsible for GPS/tablet installation, maintenance, replacements, warranties, and support for contractor-owned buses versus HCPS-owned buses?

ANSWER: The vendor is responsible.

51. **QUESTION:** How many vehicles do you plan to equip with tablets? Would you like any extra mounts?

ANSWER: Approximately 525

52. **QUESTION:** Would you be looking for the vendor to install the tablets? Would any old tablets or hardware need to be removed by the vendor as well?
- ANSWER:** HCPS could uninstall the tablets. Vendor would be responsible for installation of new tablets.
53. **QUESTION:** Our tablets are portable but would require a mount/power supply to be installed on any vehicle where the tablets will be utilized. On how many vehicles does the district require that we install mounts?
- ANSWER:** Approximately 525
54. **QUESTION:** How many tablets does HCPS currently own? What is the make and model for these tablets?
- ANSWER:** This information is not being provided at this time.
55. **QUESTION:** How many total tablets does the district need (consider number of drivers, number of buses, number of spares, etc.)?
- ANSWER:** Approximately 525
56. **QUESTION:** What is the total number of drivers who will be using the onboard tablet for navigation?
- ANSWER:** Approximately 500
57. **QUESTION:** How many others at the district will need to be trained on the tablet?
- ANSWER:** Approximately 30
58. **QUESTION:** Section 3.2.2 states In-bus GPS units should include the capability to track students and provide student lists to the driver. Is it correct to assume that the currently-installed tablets will continue to be used, and that these tablets are the devices which will provide student lists to the driver? Are there also ID card readers currently installed on the buses (both the contracted fleet and the district-owned vehicles)?
- ANSWER:** It should not be assumed that the current tablets and GPS will be used.
59. **QUESTION:** RFP states all special education buses are equipped with live GPS and time & attendance solutions. Does the district intend to partner with a new GPS and/or tablet vendor?
- ANSWER:** The district could partner with a new vendor.
60. **QUESTION:** Are the special needs buses equipped with both a GPS unit, and tablet hardware? Please clarify.
- ANSWER:** They currently are equipped with GPS and hardware.

61. **QUESTION:** What GPS data points are mandatory at go-live, including speed, door open, stop-arm deployment, hard stop, arrival/departure timestamps, route deviation, ignition status, idle time, and geofence events?

ANSWER: Speed, door open, stop-arm deployment, arrival and departures, ignition status, idle time, etc.

62. **QUESTION:** Should the GPS solution integrate with the existing AngelTrax stop-arm camera and interior bus camera systems, or are those systems outside the scope?

ANSWER: No, it would not integrate with that system.

63. **QUESTION:** Can HCPS confirm the exact number of vehicles to be included for GPS/hardware pricing, including general education buses, special education buses, spare buses, contractor-owned buses, HCPS-owned buses, and any support vehicles?

ANSWER: See RFP Page 19, Section 2, Background

64. **QUESTION:** How many total GPS-enabled vehicles transport students to and from school?

ANSWER: See RFP Page 19, Section 2, Background

65. **QUESTION:** Does the district intend to continue using its current GPS technology?

ANSWER: HCPS will continue to use the GPS that is provided with the stop arm citation software, but we are still looking for other solutions with more capabilities

66. **QUESTION:** If purchasing new GPS hardware:

- a. How many vehicles would need GPS tracking?
- b. Would you prefer to self-install or for the vendor to install?
- c. Will the district require our teams to remove any existing devices? How many?
- d. Are all vehicles located at one location for removal/installation purposes?
- e. Can you provide a fleet list with VIN numbers, make, model, and fuel types included? (This allows for proper GPS pricing)

ANSWER: Approximately 525. HCPS could remove the current hardware. Detailed bus information will be provided to the vendor that is awarded the contract.

67. **QUESTION:** Section 3.2.5 references an arrival board for school staff. Is this intended to be a web-based dashboard, a dedicated display screen in schools, or both?

ANSWER: It could possibly be both.

68. **QUESTION:** What is the time & attendance solution in use?

ANSWER: Time and attendance is managed through Oracle.

69. **QUESTION:** How many general education buses are equipped with GPS, and/or tablet solutions? Please specify each.

ANSWER: Approximately 375

70. **QUESTION:** In how many locations are buses stored?

ANSWER: Approximately 35 different lot locations.

71. **QUESTION:** If there are multiple bus locations, is it possible to consolidate the fleet to one location during GPS installation? If not, please provide locations of each site.

ANSWER: No. Locations will be provided after the award.

72. **QUESTION:** Will GPS installers have access to the district's fleet in the evenings and/or weekends?

ANSWER: Yes

73. **QUESTION:** GPS hardware – with this only being a two year commitment in terms, do you want the costs associated with proposed hardware to be split over years one and two in the Attachment for pricing, or do you want all hardware costs listed in year one along with license/maintenance (item two on Attachment I)

ANSWER: Two years

74. **QUESTION:** Potential proposed changes to contract terms (ie: cancel for convenience, etc) – are you looking for those to be identified along with the bid submission, or will you accept the opportunity to negotiate in good faith all terms/conditions after bid award?

ANSWER: See Page 28 Section 20.1.5 Tab 5 Exceptions. All proposed changes shall be submitted with your proposal.

75. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS intend to fully replace the existing Synovia/CalAmp GPS devices on all 410 contractor general-ed buses and ~120 HCPS-owned special-ed buses, or is reuse of in-place hardware preferred?

ANSWER: This information is unknown at this time.

76. **QUESTION:** Is HCPS open to a phased GPS hardware refresh (e.g., special-ed fleet first, contractor fleet second), or must the entire fleet be cut over simultaneously at go-live?

ANSWER: Open to a phased refresh.

77. **QUESTION:** Who owns the current GPS hardware – HCPS, the contractors, or Synovia/CalAmp – and who will be responsible for de-installation if devices are replaced?

ANSWER: HCPS does not own the hardware.

78. **QUESTION:** How many tablets are currently deployed across the fleet, and on which buses (special-ed only, contractor general-ed, or both)? Does HCPS want vendors to

propose new tablets as part of this solution, reuse the existing Synovia/CalAmp tablets, or price both options separately?

ANSWER: Please propose new tablets.

79. **QUESTION:** If HCPS is looking to acquire new tablets, what quantity would the district require, and who would be responsible for de-installation of the current tablets?

ANSWER: HCPS could uninstall the tablets.

80. **QUESTION:** If existing tablets should be reused, what are the device specifications (make/model, OS version, etc.)?

ANSWER: N/A

81. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS want QR, RFID, or barcode student check-in/check-out on the tablet, or is the driver manifest sufficient?

ANSWER: We do not have the staff to manage RFID cards for our students.

SCHOOL PLANNING:

82. **QUESTION:** Section 3.3.1 references generating alternative boundaries. Can HCPS clarify the anticipated frequency of boundary studies — is this an ongoing annual need, or is it project-based and episodic?

ANSWER: Boundary studies are project-based and episodic, not an annual process. HCPS anticipates a future elementary school redistricting effort related to a new elementary school currently scheduled to open in September 2029. Additional information regarding districting and redistricting procedures can be found in [HCPS Board Policy 20-0036-000, Aligning Enrollment With Capacity](#)

83. **QUESTION:** Section 3.3.5 references the use of 'HCPS planning units.' Can HCPS provide more detail about what planning units are currently used and in what format that data is available?

ANSWER: HCPS attendance areas and planning units are maintained in ArcGIS format and can be provided as shapefiles or geodatabases. Planning units are smaller geographic analysis areas used during redistricting and boundary studies. If a boundary adjustment occurs, all students within a planning unit are assigned to the same school attendance area.

CELLULAR:

84. **QUESTION:** Does the district have a preferred cell carrier through a district contract?

ANSWER: N/A

85. **QUESTION:** Are cellular/data plans expected to be provided by the vendor, HCPS, bus contractors, or another party?

ANSWER: Plans should be provided by the vendor.

86. **QUESTION:** Are vendors to assume that the district wants to continue using the presently-installed GPS devices and tablets, and thus this hardware and associated fees (cellular service, installation of new devices, etc.) should not be included in the vendor's price proposal?

ANSWER: No, vendors should not assume that information.

87. **QUESTION:** Does the HCPS currently have cellular connectivity contracts for bus communications that a new GPS vendor would need to work within, or is the vendor expected to provide cellular connectivity as part of the solution if the district does not intend to use the currently-installed hardware?

ANSWER: No, plans should be provided by the vendor.

RIDERSHIP TOOLS:

88. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS require student ridership tracking through RFID cards, barcodes, QR codes, student ID cards, driver tablet selection, mobile app check-in, or another method?

ANSWER: Not at this time.

89. **QUESTION:** Should in-bus tablets provide turn-by-turn navigation, stop-level student lists, route updates, student boarding/alighting information, emergency messaging, and driver acknowledgement features?

ANSWER: Yes.

90. **QUESTION:** What information should school staff be able to view, print, or export, including bus rosters, student lists, stop lists, arrival boards, late bus reports, and route maps?

ANSWER: Yes, to all of the above.

91. **QUESTION:** Would the district like RFID scanners for students to swipe on and off the bus? If yes,
a. How many vehicles would you plan to equip with RFID scanners?
b. How many students would be issued cards? Are RFID cards currently used?

ANSWER: No and N/A

92. **QUESTION:** How many total drivers, including substitute drivers, aides, etc., would need access to the in-vehicle tablet for student tracking purposes?

ANSWER: Approximately 500 total driver will need to use the onboard tablet for navigation and approximately 30 others at the district will need access.

93. **QUESTION:** Does the district intend to acquire solutions for Student Ridership?

ANSWER: Yes

94. **QUESTION:** Does the district currently have RFID cards?

If yes, what type and how many? No
How many vehicles are currently equipped with RFID readers? N/A

ANSWER: No and N/A

95. **QUESTION:** How many vehicles is the district planning to equip with card, or barcode/QR code readers?

ANSWER: N/A

96. **QUESTION:** How many students will be issued cards?

ANSWER: We do not want our students to have to be issued cards.

97. **QUESTION:** Do students currently have ID's? If so, are they RFID or Barcode?

ANSWER: No

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:

98. **QUESTION:** Does the district intend to acquire a new payment solution?

ANSWER: Yes

99. **QUESTION:** Please describe/list the required data to be stored and needed to successfully process a payment.

ANSWER: Manifest information, bus information, PVA pay, reimbursements, etc.

100. **QUESTION:** 3.4.1 Capability to process payment to school bus contractors based on our current formulas and contracts. Does the district have a payment solution in use already?

If yes, is there an expectation to integrate with this payments solution?

ANSWER: We currently process contractor pay with another solution and are looking to migrate to a new solution.

101. **QUESTION:** Can HCPS provide the current formulas, contract rules, rate tables, mileage calculations, approval process, and payment workflow used to calculate payments to school bus contractors?

ANSWER: This information will be made available to the awarded Offeror(s)

102. **QUESTION:** Section 3.4.1 references processing payments to bus contractors 'based on our current formulas and contracts.' Can HCPS provide an overview of the payment

formula structure — for example, is payment based on mileage, hours, flat rates, or a combination? Can examples of current formulas and contracts be provided to potential respondents in the addendum?

ANSWER: HCPS uses a hybrid payment model consisting of:

- Fixed (amortized vehicle costs)
- Variable operational payments (percentage-based)
- Time and mileage based reimbursements
- Supplemental allowances and reimbursements

103. **QUESTION:** Does the HCPS current routing software (Transfinder) have any financial management functions as described in this RFP? If so, can you provide examples of the reports/tablets, etc. that would need to have data converted to the awarded system.

ANSWER: HCPS is not providing detailed information regarding the financial management capabilities of its current routing software.

104. **QUESTION:** How many contractor invoices does HCPS typically process per month, and is the current process entirely manual?

ANSWER: We do not process contractor invoices.

105. **QUESTION:** Section 3.4.1 requires processing payments to 27 contractors based on current formulas. Can HCPS share the current contractor payment formulas (per-mile, per-route, hourly, fixed monthly, fuel escalator, etc)?

ANSWER: HCPS uses a hybrid payment model consisting of:

- Fixed (amortized vehicle costs)
- Variable operational payments (percentage-based)
- Time and mileage-based reimbursements
- Supplemental allowances and reimbursements*
- **Fuel is adjusted every week.*

106. **QUESTION:** Please confirm that the new system will calculate contractor payments and pass a payables file to Oracle AP for disbursement (with Oracle remaining the system of record for ACH/check payment, vendor master, and 1099s). Please provide any other information which might be helpful regarding the extent of the requested functionality compared to what HCPS already has and will continue to have in Oracle. In other words, what will the requested system be responsible for, and what will Oracle or other systems be responsible for?

ANSWER: The contractor pay solution does not need to be able to communicate with Oracle.

107. **QUESTION:** For county-employed driver and attendant payroll (3.4.2), is the system expected to be the system of record for time, or to feed time data into Oracle HCM for payroll processing?

ANSWER: Yes, and yes.

PARENT COMMUNICATION:

108. **QUESTION:** Section 3.1.12 mentions a parent portal and school portal. Does HCPS currently have either of these portals in operation? Are these portals part of the Transfinder system, or are they provided by another vendor?

ANSWER: We are not currently utilizing a parent portal.

109. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS require two-way parent communication to support direct messaging, broadcast announcements, emergency alerts, route-specific notifications, school-specific notifications, or all of these?

ANSWER: We currently do not require this information.

110. **QUESTION:** Should the parent app show exact bus location, approximate location, geofenced status, estimated arrival time only, or a combination of these?

ANSWER: Approximate location and geofenced status and estimated arrival time only.

111. **QUESTION:** What authentication method should parents use to access student bus information securely?

ANSWER: This information is unknown at this time.

112. **QUESTION:** For the parent-facing mobile application, does HCPS require both iOS and Android apps, and is a web-based parent portal also required?

ANSWER: Yes

SYSTEM TRANSITION, INTEGRATION, AND MANAGEMENT:

113. **QUESTION:** What specific data must be migrated from the current Transfinder routing system and Synovia/CalAmp GPS system into the new solution?

ANSWER: This information is not available at this time.

114. **QUESTION:** Can HCPS provide sample data layouts, export formats, data dictionaries, or interface specifications for the current routing, GPS, Synergy SIS, Oracle payroll/HR, contractor payment, and timekeeping systems?

ANSWER: HCPS is requesting the offerors propose solutions for these items based on the specifications provided.

115. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS expect the awarded vendor to fully replace the current routing and GPS systems, or will any existing systems remain in use during or after implementation?

ANSWER: This information is unknown at this time. Our plan is to run systems parallel during implementation. Further decisions will be made closer to time of award based on proposals received.

116. **QUESTION:** Will HCPS provide access to current system vendors, APIs, databases, exports, or technical documentation during implementation?

ANSWER: This information is not available at this time.

117. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS require historical GPS data, historical route data, student assignments, driver/attendant records, contractor payment history, or only active/current data to be migrated?

ANSWER: We require historical data for auditing purposes.

118. **QUESTION:** If remaining with Transfinder, is the current number of PLUS licenses sufficient, or would any additional licenses be needed? If so, how many?

ANSWER: Additional licenses would be needed, approximately 10.

119. **QUESTION:** Which integrations are mandatory for go-live: Synergy SIS, Active Directory/SSO, Oracle payroll/HR, GPS, contractor payment processing, parent communication, school planning, or others?

ANSWER: HCPS does not use Synergy and never stated that we use Synergy. The top priority for go-live should include eSchool and routing. Other systems priorities will be established based on the proposals received.

120. **QUESTION:** For Synergy SIS integration, should the vendor support scheduled file imports, APIs, real-time synchronization, or all of these methods?

ANSWER: HCPS does not use Synergy and never stated that we use Synergy. Scheduled file imports via flat file (.csv)

121. **QUESTION:** For Active Directory/SSO, does HCPS require SAML, OAuth/OIDC, LDAP, Microsoft Entra ID/Azure AD, or another authentication method?

ANSWER: Microsoft Entra ID/Azure AD

122. **QUESTION:** Which Oracle product/version does HCPS use for payroll and HR, and what specific data must be exchanged between Oracle and the proposed system?

ANSWER: Oracle Fusion Cloud HCM/ERP; Payroll and time for contractors

123. **QUESTION:** Should the system serve as the official timekeeping system for county-employed drivers and attendants, or only exchange transportation-related timekeeping data with Oracle?

ANSWER: Only exchange transportation-related timekeeping data with Oracle

124. **QUESTION:** Please provide the total number of metered assets and vehicles that would need to be covered by the fleet maintenance software.

ANSWER: See RFP Page 19, Section 2, Background

125. **QUESTION:** If remaining with Transfinder, is HCPS interested in adding any additional modules?

ANSWER: This will be determined based on the proposals received.

126. **QUESTION:** Is HCPS interested in any additional professional/consulting services?

ANSWER: Any additional options and all pricings shall be clearly listed in the proposal and pricing shall be provided with the cost proposal.

127. **QUESTION:** Section 3.4.3 requires Oracle integration. Can HCPS specify which Oracle product(s) are in use (e.g., Oracle Cloud HCM, Oracle PeopleSoft, Oracle ERP Cloud) and the version currently deployed?

ANSWER: Oracle Fusion Cloud HCM/ERP; Payroll and time for contractors

128. **QUESTION:** Section 3.4.4 references housing driver and attendant data including training history, DOT physical information, accident information, and license information. Approximately how many drivers and attendants does HCPS need to track records for (both county-employed and contractor-employed)?

ANSWER: HCPS currently maintains approximately 3,675 total historical and active records for drivers and attendants, including both county-employed and contractor-employed personnel.

129. **QUESTION:** Is HCPS expecting the new system to migrate existing driver and attendant historical records from a current system? If so, in what format is that data currently stored? Is this current functionality found in the Transfinder system?

ANSWER: Yes, the information needs to be migrated. We are currently utilizing a program called STARS. Information can be exported to Excel.

130. **QUESTION:** What is the anticipated timeline for transitioning off Transfinder and Synovia/CalAmp? Are existing contracts with those vendors expiring, or will early termination be required?

ANSWER: Timeline will be established with Awarded Offeror based on their proposal to work in alignment with existing contracts and their expiration dates.

131. **QUESTION:** Can the HCPS provide any information as to why this RFP has been issued? Is there a dissatisfaction with the current systems? Or is this RFP merely a requirement because existing system contracts are set to expire?

ANSWER: Existing contracts are set to expire.

132. **QUESTION:** Will HCPS require parallel operation of the old and new systems during a transition period? If so, how long?

ANSWER: Ideally, HCPS would prefer to run the old and new systems in parallel during the transition period to ensure continuity and minimize risk. However, parallel operation

cannot be guaranteed at this time. The final approach and any transition timeline will be determined based on system capabilities, implementation constraints, and operational considerations identified during project planning.

133. **QUESTION:** Can HCPS describe the current state of its data — is student, route, and driver data clean and standardized, or should vendors anticipate significant data cleansing work as part of migration?

ANSWER: Current state of data is relatively clean but depending on import specifications – may require cleansing.

134. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS have an IT project manager or internal implementation lead who will be dedicated to this project, and who will work with the vendor for primary project management?

ANSWER: Yes, that will be the Application Development and Support Team Leader.

135. **QUESTION:** Section 3.1.6 specifies training for approximately 30 core operational staff. Can HCPS clarify how many additional school-based staff would need access to distributable training

ANSWER: Probably all Principals and Assistant Principals – potentially office admin support and counseling. We have 55 schools.

136. **QUESTION:** RFP states that there are 30 core users to be trained. How many transportation personnel will be trained as power-users in the routing software?

ANSWER: All transportation staff + 1-2 IT staff as backup

137. **QUESTION:** How many power-users will need to be trained to use the fleet maintenance software?

ANSWER: 4-6

138. **QUESTION:** How many people will need power-user training in the use of GPS software?

ANSWER: See Addendum 2 Question 137

139. **QUESTION:** How many people will need power-user training on the web interface to look up routing and student busing information?

ANSWER: See Addendum 2 Question 137

140. **QUESTION:** How many Transportation personnel need to be trained as power-users in the field trip software?

ANSWER: See Addendum 2 Question 137

141. **QUESTION:** How many users will need to be trained as power-users to use the Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) software?

ANSWER: Besides transportation and IT, possibly all Principals and Assistant Principals – potentially office admin support and counseling.

142. **QUESTION:** In addition to professional installation for Student Tracking devices, we will conduct self-installation training for district staff. How many people will need to be trained?

ANSWER: IT is unaware of how these operate but will collaborate as needed.

143. **QUESTION:** Based on the following definition of a run, how many runs does the district operate? Please itemize total AM and PM runs separately for general education. Please itemize total AM and PM runs separately for special education.

“A run is defined as when a bus begins empty, picks up students, and then drops them off, leaving the bus empty. A single bus would typically have multiple runs throughout the day.” In the morning, Bus 100 has 1 high school run, 1 middle school run, and 1 elementary school run.

Example:

In the afternoon, Bus 100 has 1 high school run, 1 middle school run, and 1 elementary school run.

Bus 100 has a total of 6 runs.

ANSWER:

- Approximately 370 High School in AM
- Approximately 370 High School in PM
- Approximately 295 Middle School in AM
- Approximately 295 Middle School in PM
- Approximately 395 Elementary School (1st Tier) in AM
- Approximately 395 Elementary School (1st Tier) in PM
- Approximately 140 Elementary School (2nd Tier) in AM
- Approximately 140 Elementary School (2nd Tier) in PM

144. **QUESTION:** Can the district provide the following information in Excel, and/or CSV file exports to leverage for implementation of existing data:

Stop locations with full addresses (including city, state and zip code)?

Building location with addresses (including city, state and zip code)?

Existing routes from Transfinder?

Vehicle records

Parts

Employee records

Students

Shape files for desired Maps

ANSWER: This information will be provided to awarded the Awarded Offeror(s)

145. **QUESTION:** What is HCPS' solution/provider for Active Directory?

ANSWER: On-Prem/Cloud Azure AD

146. **QUESTION:** Other than Synergy, what other enterprise solutions does HCPS intend to integrate transportation software with? Please also include a description of the use-case, and the district's expectations with this integration.

ANSWER: HCPS has no affiliation with Synergy SIS and never stated that we did. HCPS utilizes eSchoolPlus.

147. **QUESTION:** When does the district intend to begin implementing transportation solutions?

ANSWER: Some solutions will need to implemented by January 2027.

148. **QUESTION:** When does the district expect to complete implementation of the new solutions?

ANSWER: Some solutions will need to implemented by January 2027.

DATA SECURITY AND MANAGEMENT:

149. **QUESTION:** We respectfully request clarification regarding the SOC 2 requirement in RFP 26-SR-014 for Bus Routing, Fleet Management, GPS, and School Planning Solutions.

The solicitation appears to require offerors to submit their most recent SOC 2 report, and the Data Privacy and Security Addendum references SOC 2 Type 2 compliance for non-cloud environments. Could HCPS please confirm whether a SOC 2 Type 2 report is a mandatory requirement for proposal responsiveness?

ANSWER: Yes, this will be required.

150. **QUESTION:** If an offeror does not currently have a SOC 2 Type 2 report, would HCPS consider equivalent security documentation, such as detailed data security policies, encryption standards, access control procedures, incident response procedures, vulnerability testing results, etc.?

ANSWER: No, auditors require HCPS to have these reports from vendors who store our data.

151. **QUESTION:** Additionally, if the proposed solution is hosted in a secure third-party cloud environment or through a compliant hosting partner, would HCPS accept the hosting provider's SOC 2/FedRAMP documentation in support of the offeror's proposal?

ANSWER: Yes, provided all of HCPS' data related to the offeror's product is hosted in the environment the SOC 2 report covers

152. **QUESTION:** Will HCPS accept a SOC 2 Type I report, or is a SOC 2 Type II report required?

ANSWER: A SOC 2 Type report is a mandatory requirement for proposal responsiveness.

153. **QUESTION:** If cloud hosting is proposed, does HCPS require FedRAMP Moderate authorization, SOC 2 Type II compliance, or both?

ANSWER: SOC 2 Type II compliance is acceptable. The most recent report must be provided with the final proposal for review.

154. **QUESTION:** Does HCPS require a current VPAT/Accessibility Conformance Report with the proposal to demonstrate WCAG 2.1 AA and Section 508 compliance? If any portion is not fully compliant, will HCPS accept a remediation roadmap?

ANSWER: Yes, we require VPAT and WCAG 2.1 AA and Section 508 compliance implemented. Will not accept remediation roadmap.

155. **QUESTION:** Will HCPS accept a prime contractor proposal that includes one or more COTS SaaS products, subcontractors, implementation partners, GPS hardware partners, or integration partners, provided the prime contractor remains responsible for the full scope?

ANSWER: This is not acceptable.

156. **QUESTION:** Can HCPS provide estimated user counts by role, including transportation administrators, routing staff, school-based users, drivers, attendants, contractors, planning staff, payroll/HR users, IT administrators, and parent users, for licensing and pricing purposes?

ANSWER: (Approximately)

- Transportation Administrators: 5
- Routing Staff: 5
- School based users: 5,500
- Drivers: 120
- Attendants: 100
- Contractors 27
- Planning Staff: 10
- Payroll/HR: 10
- IT: 5
- Parents: Approximately 57,000

I hereby acknowledge receipt of Addendum #2 dated June 2, 2026, to RFP # 26-SR-014
Bus Routing, Fleet Management, GPS, and School Planning.

Company

Name (Print or Type)

Authorized Signature

Date

Note: Offeror shall sign and submit Addendum with bid submission. The same person signing Addendum shall sign the Signature Sheet. Failure to submit the Addendum may deem your offer as non-responsive.