

**Office of Finance
Department of Procurement
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
45 W. Gude Drive, Suite 3100
Rockville, Maryland 20850**

September 2, 2026

NOTICE TO OFFERORS

The following are questions and responses regarding

RFP No. 7254.1, Transportation Routing System

No.	Question	Answer
1.	<u>Proposal Submission Format:</u> Section 9.0 (Mandatory Submissions) states that “No faxes or electronic submission of proposals will be accepted,” and requires one original, one flash-drive copy, and one redacted paper copy delivered by mail, courier, or hand delivery. Please confirm the reason electronic submission of the full proposal (e.g., secure upload or email) is not permitted for this RFP, and whether this is a standing MCPS procurement policy or specific to RFP 7254.1.	MCPS only accept hard copy and a flash drive submission as stated in Section 9.0.
2.	<u>Proposal Submission Format:</u> Given the volume of documentation required (point-by-point response to Attachment F, pricing proposal, Attachments A–F, financials, etc.), would MCPS consider accepting an electronic copy via a secure file-transfer method in addition to — rather than instead of — the physical submission, to reduce the risk of transmission, printing, or courier error?	No.
3.	<u>GPS / Samsara Pricing Responsibility:</u> Section 3.5 states the solution shall “pair with GPS software, such as Samsara,” and Section 6.2 lists “GPS integration” as a separately priced add-on module. Please confirm whether MCPS directly owns and pays for all Samsara (or other GPS) hardware and subscription/data fees under a separate arrangement, such that respondents need only price the cost of integrating with the existing GPS platform (interfaces, data mapping, support) rather than the underlying device or subscription cost.	Yes, MCPS has a separate agreement with Samsara GPS software. The pricing would include the integration component to the GPS platform.

4.	<u>GPS / Samsara Pricing Responsibility:</u> If MCPS does not currently have a GPS/telematics contract in place, or would consider a different GPS provider proposed by the offeror, should respondents price GPS hardware and subscription costs as part of this proposal?	MCPS has a GPS contract in place.
5.	<u>Onboard Tablets, RFID, and Ridership-Tracking Hardware:</u> Section 3.9 and Attachment F (REQ-129, REQ-130, REQ-133) describe bus-mounted tablets and “various log-on/off technologies” for student ridership tracking. Are tablets and/or RFID card readers currently installed on MCPS buses? If so, please identify the current make(s)/model(s) and whether respondents are expected to integrate with this existing hardware or to propose replacement hardware.	No tablets or RFID card readers currently installed on buses.
6.	<u>Onboard Tablets, RFID, and Ridership-Tracking Hardware:</u> If tablets and/or RFID readers are not currently installed fleet-wide, should respondent pricing include the hardware itself, in-vehicle installation labor, mounting, and recurring cellular/data communication fees for approximately 1,500 buses — or will MCPS procure and install this hardware separately from this contract?	Please include it as an add-on option. We do not currently have tablets in vehicles. You can price it as an a la carte item.
7.	<u>Onboard Tablets, RFID, and Ridership-Tracking Hardware:</u> Please identify the specific “other technologies” referenced in Section 3.9 (e.g., RFID cards, barcode scanners, biometric readers) that MCPS intends to require or accept for student log-on/log-off and ridership tracking.	“Other technologies” was used to avoid penalizing a vendor that has a different solution than listed.
8.	<u>References and Client List:</u> Section 7.0 requires, in addition to five references, a separate attachment listing “all current school district clients.” Please clarify the purpose of this complete client list (e.g., verifying scale of operations, checking for conflicts of interest, or assessing concentration risk) and confirm that it may be marked and treated as confidential commercial information under Section 11.0, given that a vendor’s complete client roster is competitively sensitive information.	Please include only the 5 references required in Section 7.0.
9.	<u>Scope, Data, and Integration Clarifications:</u> Section 2.0 states MCPS operates “more than 1,300 school buses,” while Section 6.3 directs offerors to base pricing on “approximately 1,500 buses.” Which	1,300 buses would refer to routed buses, while 1,500 would refer to the overall fleet, including spares. The

	figure should govern for per-vehicle or per-device pricing, and does the difference reflect spare vehicles, contracted/charter buses, or anticipated fleet growth?	pricing should be reflective of all 1,500 buses.
10.	<u>Scope, Data, and Integration Clarifications:</u> Section 3.5 notes that the fleet-management data source for the FASTER Web integration “is to be confirmed during implementation.” Can MCPS confirm now whether FASTER Web is the authoritative fleet data source, so that offerors can scope and price this integration accurately before proposals are due?	FASTER is the authoritative fleet data source.
11.	<u>Scope, Data, and Integration Clarifications:</u> Is the Transportation Information Management System (TIMS) referenced in Section 3.5 an MCPS-internal/custom system or a commercial product? Please identify the platform/vendor and confirm whether API or integration documentation is available to offerors in advance of proposal submission. Also please explain the functionality of this TIMS system, and how it might differ from this RFP's requested vendor system(s).	TIMS is a MCPS-internal/custom system. Used for payroll, HR-related information, on-premises server,
12.	<u>Scope, Data, and Integration Clarifications:</u> Section 3.16 requires alignment with the AI governance provisions of Appendix A, Article 18.K (including an annual Data Protection Impact Assessment and human-in-the-loop review). Do these provisions apply to any algorithmic route optimization — a standard feature of virtually all routing software — or are they intended to apply specifically to generative AI or automated decision-making features (e.g., a chatbot, automated communications, or AI-driven eligibility determinations)?	For an RFP clarification, the appropriate interpretation is to distinguish ordinary algorithmic route optimization from AI systems that make consequential decisions about individuals. Stronger governance requirements should apply when the solution uses AI/automated decision-making to make or materially influence consequential decisions about individuals, such as student transportation eligibility, disciplinary actions, student placement, denial of services, or other decisions affecting an individual's rights or access to services. MCPS requires vendors to identify which components are AI-enabled and whether they involve consequential automated decision-making.
13.	<u>Scope, Data, and Integration Clarifications:</u> Section 3.12 requires at least one full test data conversion from MapNet before cutover. Will MCPS make a sample or representative extract of current MapNet data (routes, stops, students, schedules)	Yes. It will be a good procurement practice to provide Offerors with representative sample data, provided it is properly anonymized/redacted and procurement rules allow it.

	available to offerors before proposals are due, to help scope the conversion effort and pricing, or only after award?	
14.	Contract Start Date and Implementation Timeline: Section 4.0 (Contract Term) states the initial term “shall be for two (2) years,” but also states that “the contract may not begin one day after approval by the MCPS Board of Education” — language that appears to contain a drafting error and does not identify an actual anticipated start date. Given the anticipated October/November 2026 award date (Section 13.0), can MCPS confirm (a) the month and year the contract is expected to formally commence, and (b) the target date by which the awarded solution is expected to become the live system of record for route creation and daily transportation operations (i.e., the go-live/cutover date), so that offerors can size their implementation, data-conversion, and training timelines accordingly?	July 1, 2027.
15.	<u>Pricing, Evaluation, and Process Logistics:</u> Section 6.2 and Section 3.14 both reference “fifteen (15) named or full-function users and three hundred (300) web users” as a pricing/architecture minimum. Are these figures the actual current or anticipated user counts, or minimums for scalability testing only? What is the anticipated peak concurrent user count for the map-editing environment during route-creation season?	The figures (15) are the anticipated user counts. The actual number of map editing user is 9.
16.	<u>Pricing, Evaluation, and Process Logistics:</u> Section 12.0 references a possible product demonstration for top-ranked offerors at a “District-designated demonstration facility,” in addition to the possibility of MCPS reviewing a vendor’s live system “via the Internet from an MCPS computer.” Can MCPS provide an estimated timeframe for demonstrations relative to the anticipated October/November 2026 award date, and confirm whether demonstrations may be conducted virtually, in person, or both?	Your demonstration can be in person or virtual.
17.0	Are you looking to integrate specifically with Samsara?	Yes, currently the MCPS vendor of choice.
18.0	When is the anticipated start date? Would this be for the 2027-2028 school year?	Correct, 2027-2028 school year.
19.0	The RFP states a point-by-point response. Are you wanting a response to each section or is this required only for the scope of services – 3.1 through 3.18?	To submit your proposal, you have to follow the instructions of all the sections.

		Complete Section 7.0 and Section 22.0. Complete and sign Section 23.0 and all the Attachments.
20.	Does MCPS plan to host any vendor outreach, networking, matchmaking, or other event for certified MBE and local small businesses to connect with prospective prime contractors?	N/A for the Department of Transportation (DOT)
21.	From question #20., If not, can MCPS provide a list of prospective prime bidders, if permitted, so qualified small and minority-owned businesses can explore teaming opportunities?	N/A for the Department of Transportation (DOT)
22.	Is there a process or resource MCPS recommends for firms interested in being considered as subcontractors or teaming partners?	N/A for the Department of Transportation (DOT)
23.	Will bids be open publicly? If so, what information will be provided? Can we attend in-person or virtually?	No, MCPS does not open RFP publicly.
24.	The RFP lists two different email addresses for the point of contact: 'Saudy_EspinalDeVolez@mcpsmd.org' (Section 9.0)and 'saudy_espinaldeveloz@mcpsmd.org' (Inquiries section). Could you please confirm which email address is correct for official correspondence and submissions?	Both are the same. Remember the submission will not be by email, must be hard copies.
25.	The RFP requires the Pricing Proposal to be submitted as a separate document. Could you please clarify if the Pricing Proposal should be a completely separate bound volume from the Technical Proposal, or if it should be included as a distinct, tabbed section within the same bound volume?	It should be a completely separate volume, could be in a folder.
26.	Please clarify if the submission quantity requirements (one original, one electronic, one redacted copy) apply to the total submission, or if these should be doubled if the Pricing Proposal is treated as a separate volume.	One original hard copy, including the Pricing Proposal and one flash drive including (one original, the Pricing Proposal and one redacted copy).
27.	Section 9.0 lists a "point-by-point response to each section of the RFP" as a mandatory submission requirement. Please clarify if you require a response to all RFP sections (1.0–23.0), or if you only require responses for Section 3.0 (Scope of Services) and the items requiring forms or references such as section 7 and 23.	In general, you have to follow the instructions of all the sections but you have to respond to these sections: - 3.0 - 6.0 - 7.0. - 22.0 - 23.0 - All the attachments

28.	The bus-mounted tablet module is listed as a separately priced add-on. Please advise if there is any existing hardware (e.g., GPS, tablets, tablet mounts) on the buses, and if so, please provide details on what is currently installed.	No existing tablet hardware installed.
29.	If the District is seeking new hardware, is the intent for it to be supplied by the Contractor or integrated with existing devices? If Contractor-supplied, what approximate quantity (and any spare allowance) should offerors assume?	If hardware is required, MCPS would like the contractor to supply it and integrate it with existing devices.
30.	The RFP notes that the new solution will replace the incumbent routing platform. Could the District please confirm the name of the current/past routing software or system currently in use?	Trapeze Mapnet (Now Busology)
31.	Regarding the system integration requirements, could the District please confirm the name and version of the current SIS that the new routing solution is required to interface with?	MCPS SIS is currently Synergy, the Schema Version is 1001 the proposed routing solution must interface with the SIS to support the required exchange of student, school, enrollment, and transportation-related data.
32.	With an anticipated award date of October/November 2026, could the District please provide the target date for full project completion and system implementation?	July 1, 2027.
33.	To assist in developing a comprehensive training proposal, could the District please provide the estimated staff counts for each user group requiring training on the new system (e.g., routing personnel, dispatchers, and school-based administrators)?	7 dispatchers. 7 routers. And approximately 100 admin staff in DOT.
34.	Pricing proposal format (Sections 7.0, 8.4, and 9.0). Section 8.4 directs offerors to submit the pricing proposal as a separate document, and Section 9.0 lists it as a required submission without a referenced attachment. Is there a District-provided cost proposal template or pricing form that offerors must use, or should offerors present pricing in their own format following the structure and required detail outlined in Section 7.2?	MCPS does not have a template for the Pricing Proposal, you can present pricing in your own format.
35.	Bus-mounted tablets — quantity and supply model (Sections 3.9 and 8.2). The bus-mounted tablet module is listed as a separately priced add-on. Is the District seeking hardware supplied by the Contractor, or integration with existing onboard devices? If Contractor-supplied, what approximate quantity (and any spare allowance) should offerors assume?	MCPS would like the contractor to supply the tablets and integrate it with existing software.

36.	Tablet connectivity (Section 3.9). If bus-mounted tablets are in scope, does the District want the Contractor to include cellular data service in its pricing, or will connectivity be provided by the District?	Yes, we would like to see all options.
37.	GPS platform confirmation (Section 3.5). Section 3.5 references pairing with GPS software "such as Samsara." To scope the integration, please confirm the District's current GPS/telematics provider and whether GPS is deployed fleet-wide or on a subset of vehicles.	Samsara is the provider and is fleet wide.
38.	Field-trip billing integration with Oracle Cloud Business Hub (Sections 3.6 and 3.9). The RFP requires field-trip billing to post to Oracle Cloud Business Hub for AR and GL. Does the District expect a direct/prebuilt system integration, or is a file-based export for import into Oracle acceptable?	Prefer the option for a direct/prebuilt system integration. Also, a file-based export is acceptable. The Field Trip application should be priced as an option add-on. You can price it as an a la carte line item.
39.	Regarding REQ-053, for home-to-school and school-to-home transportation (excluding activity trips), does the district provide transportation to any surrounding counties? If so, which counties?	Yes! MCPS provides transportation services to Frederick, Baltimore, Prince George's, Virginia, DC Counties, and other surrounding jurisdictions.
40.	Do you have a preferred map source?	N/A
41.	Does the school have a county GIS department we can work with to determine map source? Contact Name: Phone Number:	YES! The details and contact person will be provided after the award.
42.	How many transportation personnel will be trained as users in the routing software? Full access _____ and read-only _____	Approximately 100.
43.	In how many separate locations will staff be located during training?	7 locations.
44.	How many Transportation staff need to be trained in the field trip software? Full access _____ and read-only _____	The Field Trip application should be priced as an option add-on. Full Access- 10 Read-Only - 25
45.	How many people will need to be trained to request trips in the field trip software?	The software will be used by school admins to submit trip requests (approx up to 400 staff). The Field Trip application should be priced as an option add-on.

46.	How many people will be trained to approve of trips?	Field Trip personnel within the Division of Transportation (approx. 5-10 staff).
47.	Will budget staff be using the field trip software? If so, how many will be trained?	No.
48.	Will field trip software be rolled out in transportation only or district-wide?	The software will be used by school admins to submit trip requests (approx. up to 400 staff) and managed by Transportation Field Trip personnel (approx. 5-10 staff). The Field Trip application should be priced as an option add-on.
49.	If district-wide, is the plan to phase in or have all schools and departments come online at the same time?	It would need to be all at once to establish continuity. The Field Trip application should be priced as an option add-on.
50.	How many users will need to be trained to use the fleet maintenance software?	MCPS currently has a contractual agreement in place with a fleet maintenance software solution.
51.	How many users will need to be trained to use the Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) software?	If tracking assets internally it's approximately 100.
52.	How many people will need training on the web interface to look up routing and student busing information?	Up to 30 people.
53.	Based on the following definition of a run, how many runs does the district operate? “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.” Example: * In the morning, Bus 100 has 1 high school run, 1 middle school run, and 1 elementary school run. * 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.	1200 routes with 4 tiers per route. Up to 4800 runs.
54.	Does the District expect vendors to quote pricing for building both AM and PM runs built for regular education students?	No, we have routers on staff to create the route. The software will be used for optimizing the routes.
55.	In addition to professional installation, we will conduct self-installation training for district staff. How many people will need to be trained?	6 staff.

56.	How many people will need training in the use of GPS software?	N/A. GPS already online.
57.	In how many locations are buses stored?	5 locations.
58.	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.	N/A. GPS already onboard.
59.	Will GPS installers have access to the district's fleet on evenings and/or weekends?	N/A. GPS already onboard.
60.	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?	Between 1450 to 1600 buses.
61.	How many total tablets does the district need (consider number of drivers, number of buses, number of spares, etc.)?	Between 1450 to 1600 buses.
62.	What is the total number of drivers who will be using the onboard tablet for navigation?	Over 1300.
63.	How many others at the district will need to be trained on the tablet?	Between 100 to 150.
64.	In how many locations are buses stored?	5.
65.	If there are multiple bus locations, is it possible to consolidate the fleet to one location during tablet installation?	No.
66.	Will tablet installers have access to the district's fleet on evenings and/or weekends?	This can be negotiated if needed.
67.	Does the district intend to provide RFID cards, bar codes, and/or QB codes to track ridership for general education, special needs, or both? Please specific quantity for each.	TBD
68.	Does the district currently have RFID cards? If yes, what type and how many?	No.
69.	How many vehicles are currently equipped with RFID readers?	N/A
70.	How many vehicles is the district planning to equip with card readers?	N/A
71.	How many students will be issued cards?	N/A
72.	In addition to professional installation for Student Tracking devices, we will conduct self-installation	N/A

	training for district staff. How many people will need to be trained?	
73.	What is the projected date range for vendor interviews and/or demonstrations? Will these be hosted in-person, or virtually?	September/October 2026. We will only hold these with potential vendors after we evaluate the proposals.
74.	What is the anticipated start date for implementation?	July 2027.
75.	What is the desired go-live date for software and hardware? Please specify each if different.	July 2027.
76.	Regarding REQ-058, does the district require onsite training for the operational staff?	Yes.
77.	Does the district utilize contracted vehicles for home to school and school to home, daily transportation? If yes, how many vehicles and how many routes are serviced by contractors?	No.
78.	Under System Reporting Capabilities/Data, REQs-160-162 are missing a priority designation. Please provide the desired priority level on these specifications.	REQs-160-162 are high priority.
79.	Regarding REQ-092-097, can MCPS provide examples of the reports identified, including the parent letters?	After the vendor evaluations.
80.	Regarding 3.5 System Integrations and Interfaces. Please provide example use-cases and MCPS' expected functionality for the desired integrations between TIMS and FASTER Web.	We would like to have the routing software receive info from FASTER. For example, if a bus is taken out of service, then the routing software will be updated about that bus's status.
81.	For data conversion, can MCPS provide the following items in Excel, or .CSV file format? Please state yes, or no for each item. Please list any other Excel or .CSV files MCPS can provide to be utilized in implementation. • Pre-approved bus stop addresses • Bus stop classifications • Boundaries (walk, hazard, district etc.) • School buildings with addresses • Bell times • Programs • Walk to stop limits per school and grade • Employees • Vehicles • Vehicle features	Yes to all.

	• Students • Student Accommodations	
82.	Please identify the current transportation routing platform and version, the available export formats, the approximate volumes of students, stops, routes, vehicles, schools, depots, and retained historical years, and whether the selected contractor must migrate route history, attachments, geocodes, and custom reports.	Mapnet (TripSpark now Busology) now on version 5.0.65535.0. Run on Oracle. The export format is Excel. Yes to the Migration of route history, attachments, geocodes, and custom reports.
83.	Please provide the systems and interface standards for required integrations, including the student information system, identity/SSO, GIS or authoritative street network, AVL/GPS or fleet telematics, messaging services, school calendars, and any special-education or alternative transportation systems, together with required interface frequencies.	MCPS is currently using Synergy for SIS, Microsoft MFA for authentication, MCPS GIS, county GIS, Esri, street centerlines, AVL/GPS / fleet telematics - GPS location, vehicle ID, speed, route status, messages are sent via Email, SMS/text, push notifications, School calendar feed, Special education needs routes, wheelchair requirements, taxi/contract transportation.
84.	What scenarios, quantitative metrics, and performance thresholds will MCPS use to evaluate and accept automated routing—for example route computation time, capacity and bell-time compliance, ride-time limits, special-education constraints, mainstreamed multi-school sequencing, school pairing, and ride-through handling?	We want all of these examples. Some thresholds include bypass routing for railroad crossings, etc. We need to see what is available prior to setting our thresholds.
85.	What is the required production date, and does MCPS anticipate a pilot, phased deployment, or parallel operation with the incumbent? Please also clarify whether the parent application must be native iOS and Android software or whether a secure responsive web/PWA solution is acceptable.	Spring 2027. Some parallel operation with incumbent software.
86.	Please confirm the intended initial contract term and renewal options, and whether respondents may bundle configuration, migration, training, and implementation into the recurring SaaS subscription rather than presenting a separate one-time implementation fee.	The initial term of contract shall be for two (2) years and 4 one-year renewals.
87.	Does the district have an anticipated date for finalist presentations for vendors that are selected to move on to that phase? Would they be held in person or virtually?	September/October 2026. TBD.
88.	What routing solution is the district currently using?	Mapnet.

89.	Could the district please break down the 1,500 vehicles by route buses, spares, special needs vans, shuttles, etc.	Will be provided as an attachment after the vendor evaluations.
90.	How many students are transported daily? How many are regular vs. special needs?	DOT transports approximately 103,000 students daily.
91.	For home-to-school transportation, in which county(s) are you transporting students?	Frederic, Baltimore, PG, District of Columbia and Virginia counties
92.	Does the district own and operate the school bus fleet or are private contractors used?	MCPS own the fleet.
93.	If contracted, how many and what bus contractors are used?	N/A. No contractors.
94.	If contracted, will contractor personnel be required to use any of the software? If yes, Will the contractors be responsible for performing route creation and maintenance?	N/A. No contractors.
95.	How many contractor employees will need training?	N/A. No contractors.
96.	Will the district also perform route creation and data maintenance?	Yes! That is the main job we do in the routing office.
97.	Will they need read-only access to the data, reporting and maps?	Some staff will have editing right; some read access and some admin right.
98.	What is the desired date for taking delivery of the software and starting training?	July 2027.
99.	What is the desired date for full implementation/go live of the specified software systems, including all district, student, map, route, field trip and other required data?	July 2027.
100.	Is GPS hardware currently installed on district vehicles? If so, What type of hardware is installed and who is the vendor?	Yes. Samsara.
101.	Does the district intend to continue using its current GPS technology?	Yes.
102.	If purchasing new GPS hardware: a. How many vehicles would need GPS tracking?	N/A
103.	Will the district require our teams to remove any existing devices? How many?	N/A
104.	Are all vehicles located at one location for removal/installation purposes?	No. Multiple locations (5).
105.	Can you provide a fleet list with VIN numbers, make, model, and fuel types included? (This allows for proper GPS pricing)	N/A
106.	Does the district have any tablets currently installed on district vehicles? If so, What type/model tablets are they and how many vehicles have them?	No.

107.	Is the district interested in upgrading or purchasing new tablets as part of this request?	Yes, as part of a line item from the vendor.
108.	How many vehicles would you plan to equip with tablets?	1450-1600.
109.	Would you be looking for the vendor to install the tablets?	Please include it as an add-on option. We do not currently have tablets in vehicles. You can price it as an a la carte item.
110.	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?	Please include it as an add-on option to install the tablets.
111.	Would any be installed on 3rd party contractor vehicles? If so, does the district have a contract to allow them to do that?	No.
112.	Does the district have a preferred cell carrier through a district contract?	Yes. Verizon.
113.	Does the district need any additional mounts? If so, how many?	Only what's required for the tablets.
114.	Would the district like RFID scanners for students to swipe on and off the bus? If yes, How many vehicles would you plan to equip with RFID scanners?	Not in use, however, would be interested in seeing the solution and price as an optional line item.
115.	How many students would be issued cards? Are RFID cards currently used?	If implemented, it would be >100,000.
116.	How many total drivers, including substitute drivers, aides, etc. would need access to the in-vehicle tablet for student tracking purposes?	More than 2,000 if including 700+ aids.
117.	As part of this RFP request, is the district interested in purchasing new Fleet maintenance software? If so, how many metered assets would be managed?	No.
118.	To accurately price the work required for conversion of your current trip and stop data for potential import, could the district provide a.csv file that includes a row for each non-school stop, with the following attributes: Trip Name (or ID), Trip Type (To School/From School), School Code, Stop Name (Location), Stop Time, X Coordinate and Y Coordinate. While these attributes comprise the baseline data that can be imported, Transfinder will consider additional data points for possible import as well. Please provide this data likewise in csv format.	Yes.
119.	Is it the district's intent that district staff will place the district's existing stops and build the district's existing bus runs in the system during the training process, or does the district expect the vendor will implement everything noted above?	Vendor should implement everything noted above.

120.	If it is the district's intent that district staff will place the stops and build the runs, then the below questions can be disregarded.	OK.
121.	If it is the district's intent that the vendor will implement everything noted above, please answer the following questions: Regarding the route structure for your bus runs, are you picking up K-12 all in one bus run (i.e., single tier)? Do you pick up high school students and drop them off, then pick up middle school students and drop off, and then elementary school (i.e., three tiers)?	Four tiers. High School Middle School Elementary School I Elementary School II
122.	What is the total number of individual runs/trips performed by all general education buses in the morning ?	Approximately 700 regular education routes; 550 special education routes.
123.	(Ex: If 15 vehicles do a High School / Middle School run, then 17 vehicles do an Elementary run, that is 32 AM runs/trips total.)	Yes.
124.	How many general education runs/trips in the afternoon ?	Approximately 700 regular education routes; 550 special education routes.
125.	Are the afternoon bus runs essentially a 'mirror' of the morning runs? (Same core stop locations? Buses generally run in the same area AM & PM?)	Approximately 700 regular education routes; 550 special education routes.
126.	How many special needs runs operate in the morning ? How many in the afternoon ?	Approximately 700 regular education routes; 550 special education routes.

Saudy Espinal, Buyer II
Department of Procurement

Please indicate your receipt of this notice by signing below and returning with your proposal or under a separate cover.

Accepted: _____
Name and Title

Company Name: _____