KANSAS CITY AREA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

ADDENDUM NO. 1

Request for Proposals (RFP) F25-5016-34B
KCATA Fare Payment System

Issue Date: October 23, 2025

This Addendum is hereby made a part of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Project Documents to the same extent as if it was originally included therein and is intended to change and/or interpret the RFQ documents by additions, deletions, clarifications, or corrections. The Contractor shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the proposal submittals.

DOCUMENT CHANGES/CLARIFICATIONS

1. Section 1, "Proposal Schedule"

   The RFP Closing Date is changed to November 5, 2025, at 2:00 p.m. Central Time.

2. Section 3.3.B, "Proposal Delivery"

   A. Firms may submit proposals electronically via a secure FTP site assigned to the Proposer. The site is password protected and only accessible the firm and KCATA's Procurement department. **Firms must request this site via email to Denise Adams and Kristen Emmendorfer no later than October 31. Requests submitted after 2:00 p.m. Central will be fulfilled the next business day.**

   B. In your request, please provide the emails for the individuals requiring access. The emails must be "security type" and cannot be a group email (ex. "info@" or "RFP Team@"). Each person will receive the site information and password from KCATA's IT department.

   C. All documents must be submitted by the stated deadline. After the deadline, proposer access will be removed.

   D. KCATA will accept forms signed with DocuSign or Adobe Sign. Prior to contract award, the selected firm will be required to submit the original, executed Price Proposal Summary, Affidavits, Certifications and Performance Bond with WET SIGNATURES as instructed in Section 4 and clarified herein.

   C. The Price Proposal (Attachments C-1-A and C-1-B), Buy America Certification (Attachment K) and copy of the Proposal Bond are due with the submittal or your proposal will be considered non-responsive.

   D. The original, executed Proposal Bond is due to KCATA no later than 5:00 p.m. Central Time on November 6, 2025. Instructions for delivery are stated in the RFP.

3. Section 4.4, "Technical Proposal"

   A. The Technical Proposal page limit is changed to **60 pages**.

   B. Resumés, sample warranty documents, exceptions/omissions to the Sample Agreement, exceptions/omissions to the Technical Specifications, and any other documents requested in the RFP may be submitted as Appendices in Volume 2 and identified in the Table of Contents. Appendices are not included in the page count.

4. Section 4.6, “Proposal Evaluation Criteria”

KCATA is providing a “Technical Requirements Matrix” that will provide more detail on the proposal evaluation process.

5. RFP Attachments and Supplemental Documents

The following documents have been updated and the revised documents available on the project’s FTP site.

- Price Proposal Summary (Attachment C-1-A) Revised 10/22/2205
- Price Proposal form (Attachment C-1-B) Revised 10/22/2025
- The Fare Payment Specifications Revised 10/22/2025
- Technical Proposal Requirement Matrix New 10/22/2025
- Receipt of Addenda Form New 10/23/2025 (included with this Addendum)

PROPOSER QUESTIONS/REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

1. Q: Is KCATA tax exempt.

   A: Yes.

2. Q: Are vendors permitted to submit multiple proposals featuring varied pricing structures? If multiple pricing options exist for KCATA, in addition to the requested form of the price sheet, would proposers be allowed to submit these options?

   A: Yes. Along with the original price proposal document, Vendors may submit multiple pricing proposals under a single proposal. Alternate proposals (technical and price) are to be clearly specified as such.

3. Q: Given that this project is federally funded and subject to Buy America Requirements, would KCATA consider accepting a vendor-certified waiver for specific equipment if the vendor believes it qualifies for an FTA-issued waiver under applicable guidelines?

   A: KCATA’s Buy America Certification form is required with the proposal submittal, or the proposal will be considered non-responsive. A vendor may submit a certified waiver for specific equipment as a supplemental document. KCATA reserves the right to review the waiver and ensure that FTA will accept the waiver.

4. Q: The RFP and Sample Agreement require both a Performance Bond and a Payment/Warranty Bond in the amount of 100% of the contract value. The 100% value is not aligned to recent market practices when procuring modern fare collections platforms.

   Given that this procurement primarily concerns a technology and service-based system (including software, licenses, equipment supply, and ongoing maintenance) rather than a physical capital infrastructure project, a bid bond requirement is an unusual and unnecessarily restrictive requirement.

   Bid bonds were historically used to reduce risk for physical infrastructure or to address legacy design-build-operate-maintain software projects. However, KCATA has asked for a more modern account-based, hosted platform. A proven and already operating Software-as-a-Service platform that serves many agencies carries a much lower risk profile and eliminates the need for bonding requirements. This prohibitive approach may prevent many innovative technology vendors from bidding.

We respectfully request that KCATA remove the bond requirement entirely and instead ask proposers to state how many “tenants” (agencies or private operators) currently use their platform. The more tenants, the more certain the solution is proven, reliable, and low-risk. Many of the recent fare collection RFPs from the last few years of similar scale have not required bonds, such as Sacramento, Indianapolis and others. Thank you.

Q: In addition, the maintenance/guarantee bond is to secure the Contractor’s obligation to replace or repair defective products, equipment and materials and faulty workmanship for a minimum period of one (1) year after final payment (see above question) and shall be written in an amount equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the Contract Sum, as adjusted (if at all). Given that the Performance Bond, we recommend that this bond be removed as a requirement and if not, it be limited to the maintenance value as the system will be in revenue service at this point and the Authority receiving beneficial use of the delivered system.

Q: KCATA requires additional security for these guarantees in the form of a separate maintenance (or guarantee) bond in form acceptable to KCATA written by the same corporate surety that provides the performance bond for this Contract. This will need to be put into place prior to the release of final payment. It is assumed that the final payment is associated with system acceptance, which we would like to validate with the Authority.

Q: On Page 2 of the RFP it is noted that the "Performance bond in the full amount of the price proposal will be due prior to Notice to Proceed." However, under Section 5, Bonding Requirements (Page 25), it is stated under Paragraph A.1., that "The Contractor shall furnish, at its own expense, a performance bond and payment bond payable to KCATA in the amount of five percent (5%) of the full expected cost of the services to be performed (goods to be delivered) from a licensed, fully qualified surety company acceptable to KCATA and listed as a company currently authorized under 31 CFR Part 22 as possessing a certificate of Authority as described hereunder. The bonds shall remain valid and in effect for the full term of this Contract. KCATA may require an increase in the bond amount in the event of changes to the contract price." We believe the 5% number is the correct one as a 100% Performance Bond is highly unusual and severely limits competition, but would like to confirm our assumption.

Q: The RFP does not specify the format or method for submitting the Proposal Bond. We understand that it may follow the same acceptable forms described for the Performance and Payment Bonds — that is, either a surety bond issued by a licensed and fully qualified surety company acceptable to KCATA, or alternatively, a cash deposit, certified check, irrevocable letter of credit (LOC), or other negotiable instrument approved by KCATA, as stated in Section 2.3.4 of the RFP.

Please consider removing the bond requirement altogether. If a bond is ultimately required, please confirm that this interpretation is correct and that the same forms of security are acceptable for the Proposal Bond.

Q: Would KCATA discuss other mechanisms besides a Performance Bond (as well as Maintenance Bond) that would provide reasonable assurances to the Authority for its risk concerns?

Q: Rather than for the full term of the contract, we request the Performance Bond be released after the system goes into revenue service as KCATA will have beneficial use of the system at that time.

Q: Since the Authority has a Performance Bond under Section 5, Bonding Requirements, as well as company warranty and support services we recommend the removal of Paragraph B.3., where it is noted that "As additional security for these guarantees, the Contractor shall, prior to the release of final payment, furnish separate maintenance (or guarantee) bonds in form acceptable to KCATA written by the same corporate surety that provides the performance bond for this Contract. These bonds shall secure the Contractor's obligation to replace or repair defective products, equipment and materials and faulty workmanship for a minimum period of one (1) year after final payment and shall be written in an amount equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the Contract Sum, as adjusted (if at all)." And, if the Authority will not remove this bonding requirement, it is very challenging to manage for a 100% risk profile after the system has gone into revenue service (beneficial use). If the Authority is concerned about a "fleet defect," we suggest that a clause be added to the terms and conditions rather than managing this through a bonding mechanism.

Q: Rather than for the full term of the contract, we request the Performance Bond be released after the system goes into revenue service as KCATA will have beneficial use of the system at that time.

Q: Would KCATA discuss other mechanisms besides a Performance Bond (as well as Maintenance Bond) that would provide reasonable assurances to the Authority for its risk concerns?

Q: Since the Authority has a Performance Bond under Section 5, Bonding Requirements, as well as company warranty and support services we recommend the removal of Paragraph B.3., where it is noted that "As additional security for these guarantees, the Contractor shall, prior to the release of final payment, furnish separate maintenance (or guarantee) bonds in form acceptable to KCATA written by the same corporate surety that provides the performance bond for this Contract. These bonds shall secure the Contractor's obligation to replace or repair defective products, equipment and materials and faulty workmanship for a minimum period of one (1) year after final payment and shall be written in an amount equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the Contract Sum, as adjusted (if at all)." And, if the Authority will not remove this bonding requirement, it is very challenging to manage for a 100% risk profile after the system has gone into revenue service (beneficial use). If the Authority is concerned about a "fleet defect," we suggest that a clause be added to the terms and conditions rather than managing this through a bonding mechanism.

A: Proposer's comments and requests are duly noted. KCATA's bond requirements will remain as stated in the RFP.

- The Proposal Bond is 5% of the total project cost.
- The Performance/Payment Bond is 100% of the total project cost and is due prior to Notice to Proceed with selected contractor.
- The Warranty/Maintenance Bond is 100% of the Contract Sum, as adjusted (if at all).
- In lieu of a surety bond issued by a licensed and fully qualified surety company acceptable to KCATA, Proposers may submit a cash deposit, certified check, irrevocable letter of credit (LOC), or other negotiable instrument approved by KCATA.

5. Q: Where should bidders provide exceptions and omissions to KCATA's list of specifications? Is this part of Volume 2?

A: Proposers are required to cite exceptions and omissions to the sample contract provided using WORD and electronic edits in an easily read ink color other than black. Federal Transit Administration terms are NOT negotiable. Failure of Proposer to cite exceptions to the sample contract may disqualify the firm from advancing to next steps in evaluation process. If there are no exceptions and omissions cited, make this statement in response.

6. Q: In Section 3.3.3, the RFP states that, regarding the USB drive copy, "Each Volume 1 through 3 shall be submitted as a separate .pdf file and labeled accordingly." However, in the Submittal Checklist, under "Required Documents Provided Separately," Attachment C-1-B ("Detailed Price Proposal") is listed in Excel format.

We understand that the submission should include one physical original of the proposal (unbound) and one USB drive copy containing a scanned PDF of each Volume (Volumes I through III). Additionally, we interpret that the USB drive should also include a separate folder labeled "Required_Documents" with the Attachment C-1-B file in its native Excel (.xlsx) format, along with any other items listed as "provided separately."

Please confirm or clarify whether this interpretation is correct?

Alternatively, please consider removing the need for a physical submission of the RFP all together. Thank you for your consideration.

A: See Item 2 above.

- Volume 1 shall include the signed Price Proposal Summary (C-1-A), a copy of their Detailed Price Proposal (C-1-B), Schedule of Participation, and Letter of Intent to Subcontract (if applicable) in one .pdf document. The Detailed Price Proposal is to also be submitted as a separate Excel document.
- Volume 2 shall include a copy of the redlined sample agreement, exceptions to the specifications, and sample warranty in the combined .pdf document. The sample agreement with redlined exception and suggested language is to also be submitted as separate Word document.
- A copy of the executed Proposal Bond is required in Volume 3 as part of the combined .pdf document.
- Financial statements shall be submitted as a separate .pdf document and marked "Confidential" as instructed in the RFP.
- A separate folder for "Required Documents" is not required but is allowed.

7. Q: Can the agency explain the requirement for a warranty document detailing favorable terms for similar projects? Would the agency accept an explanation of our warranty terms or would it prefer a sample warranty from another project?

A: A sample warranty from another project (similar to what is being offered to KCATA) is acceptable.

8. Q: We would appreciate clarification regarding the evaluation criteria described in Section 4.6.

Section 4.4 – Technical Proposal (Volume I) outlines several required sections (e.g., General Business Background, Identification of Lead Personnel, Skills, Qualifications and Experience, Project Approach, Management and Organization, and Warranty). However, the evaluation criteria in Section 4.6 refers to broader factors such as Technical Experience and Qualifications, Past Performance, and Product Proposed, Quality Control and Support.

To ensure that our proposal is structured in full alignment with the evaluation process, could you please confirm or indicate which sections or parts of the Technical Proposal (Volume I) will be used to assess each of the technical evaluation criteria?

Q: We are seeking clarification regarding the alignment between the Evaluation Criteria outlined on page 15 of the RFP and the required structure of the Technical Proposal as described in Volume 2.

While the Technical Proposal format provides detailed guidance on the organization and content of the submission (e.g., General Business Background, Identification of Lead Personnel, Project Approach, etc.), the Evaluation Criteria are listed separately and do not explicitly map to these sections. To ensure our proposal is responsive and appropriately addresses each criterion, could KCATA please clarify the following:

- How do the Evaluation Criteria (Technical Experience and Qualifications, Past Performance, Price Proposal, Product Proposed/Quality Control/Support) correspond to specific sections of the Technical Proposal?

- Will points be assigned to specific sections of the Technical Proposal, and if so, can KCATA provide a breakdown or scoring rubric that indicates how each section contributes to the total score?

A: KCATA seeks from Proposers answers to technical criteria listed with each Proposer responsible for determining how to best convey their qualifications and expertise. The "broad" categories as stated, are provided as a baseline for Proposers. Identifying which sub elements are represented in the Proposal submittal is up to the firm. KCATA seeks a clear and deep understanding of the technical and project scope/deliverables. The "several required sections", per the questions, are provided by KCATA to offer thought provoking areas of coverage in the proposal that will capture how firms who propose convey how and why their firm is best qualified to be selected for the award.

Please see the Technical Proposal Requirements Matrix provided as part of this Addendum

9. Q: Could you please clarify how the 20 points assigned to the Price Proposal will be calculated across the proposers?

A: Procurement evaluates the price proposal, with the lowest priced proposal receiving the maximum points. Other price proposals are compared to the lowest priced proposal and points are proportionately assigned.

10. Q: How will optional components () be scored as part of the 30 points for "Technical Experience and Qualifications" ?

A: Optional components are an opportunity for vendors to demonstrate innovative approaches and/or accessory services that enhance the fare collection experience.

11. Q: This project is funded in part by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). There is no Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal established for this project. Firms are encouraged to take part in this project as Prime Contractors, Subcontractors or Suppliers. Given this, is there any benefit to Bidders to provide DBE content - meaning, will that proposal receive additional points for the inclusion of DBE partners?

A: No additional points will be given.

12. Q: In the RFP there are 400 validators required but only 310 buses stated as a fleet total. Are the extra 90 validators going to be used as spares?

A: There are 315 buses across the regional fleet. With a 10% spare ratio and a few extras for training purposes, the RideKC fleet would need 350 validators. 400 was simply used as an estimate for pricing purposes.

13. Q: How does KCATA currently do L2 maintenance? Does their vision for how L2 maintenance will work under the new AFC contract?

A: KCATA usually manages L2 maintenance issues in-house and plans to do so as part of managing the hardware components associated with fare collection. KCATA will not manipulate or "open up" any piece of equipment, especially electronic components, that may result in any warranties being voided.

14. Q: To better understand the total cost of ownership of the proposed automated fare collection system, will KCATA request vendors to disclose their negotiated payment processing rates with acquirers such as FiServ, Elavon, or Cybersource? These fees – paid directly to the payment processor – can significantly impact KCATA's long-term operating costs and are separate from vendor fees. We recommend KCATA consider including this in the evaluation criteria and have provided a sample Excel-based cost scenario tool to assist in modeling these fees based on fare levels and ridership volumes.

A: If there are any costs that KCATA is expected to take on as part of contracting with a vendor, KCATA would prefer the vendor to state these costs as part of their submittal. Should any information be proprietary or non-disclosable as part of a Freedom of Information Act request, the vendor should state so as part of the submittal.

15. Q: Please provide a list of Counties and/or the zip codes where you will want network coverage.

A: Fixed-route services currently operate in Johnson and Wyandotte Counties in Kansas, and Platte, Clay and Jackson Counties in Missouri. Future service may exist in Leavenworth County in Kansas and Cass County in Missouri.

16. Q: Does KCATA have any existing relationships with any retailers? If yes, please provide a list.

A: KCATA does not have a relationship with any retailers today as part of a pass outlet program but previously had relationships with a variety of retailers when fare collection was last in place in 2019.

17. Q: Most large retailers have long lead times to introducing new products, some as long as six months or more.

- Will KCATA be willing/able to wait to launch the retail network to accommodate the merchants' operational requirements?
- Or possibly launch in a phased approach depending on merchant availability?

A: KCATA understands that the nature of a fare collection launch may require a phased approach and would consider the growth of the retail network to be phased, as well. KCATA would ask that vendors help KCATA through all phases of a launch to increase accessibility to passes.

18. Q: Given the desired go-live date prior to the June 2026 World Cup, would KCATA consider a phased delivery approach (i.e., partial delivery of the rider-facing components)?

A: Yes, KCATA is aware of the tight launch schedule and would consider phased delivery. The preference is a full launch prior to World Cup but is willing to work with the selected vendor to phase a launch in a manner that allows accessibility to the fare system.

19. Q: Is KCATA utilizing a consultant for this project? If yes, who is your consulting partner?

A: KCATA has worked with HNTB to prepare the scope of work but is currently carrying out the procurement internally.

20. Q: In Section 2.3 – System Description, the RFP lists "Handheld Ticket Validators (optional) to collect fares on paratransit" as part of the scope of work.

However, no quantities are provided in the RFP or pricing forms. Please clarify whether proposers should include these devices in the price proposal, and if so, how many units should be assumed (both totals and spares)?

A: This is envisioned as a future offering and not as part of the original rollout. In total, a vendor should consider the need for 200 handheld validators.

21. Q: The Price Proposal Form includes a field for the "InComm Cash Digitization Fee (%)" and "Transaction Revenue Share".

- Could you please clarify whether KCATA intends to provide an estimated total number or value of cash digitization transactions to be used for budgeting purposes?
- Additionally, could you confirm whether this percentage will be considered in the financial evaluation and scoring of the Price Proposal, or if it is requested for informational purposes only to understand the potential operating cost impact to KCATA?

A: KCATA estimates a total amount of cash transactions of up to $10 million annually. Any fee-related structures that will impact KCATA's overall cost, including operation estimates, should be stated to allow KCATA to properly assess what the total cost of maintaining a fare system may be.

22. Q: We understand that optional components (open payments, third-party contactless media, Handheld Ticket Validators, etc.) should be excluded from the price form, as there is not a section for them. Please confirm this is correct.

If this is not correct, please provide an updated price form with optional components split out, to ensure an apples-to-apples comparison between proposers who include an optional component and those who do not, for each optional item.

A: The price form has been updated to encourage vendors to state any and all known fees that KCATA and its regional partners may have to pay as part of launching a fare collection system and maintaining ongoing operations of a fare collection system.

23. Q: In Section 2.3 – System Description, the RFP lists the following system components as part of the scope of work:

Ticket Office Terminals (TOTs) that support media and fare product sales, including issuing personalized fare media and reloading of value, or Mobile Sales Devices (MSDs) as a portable alternative to the stationary TOT.

The Scope of Services states that there are two in-person locations; however, it does not specify how many units/workstations at each location in the RFP or pricing forms. As any hardware is costed per unit, could you please clarify the total number of units that should be included in the price proposal?

A: There are two KCATA in-service locations. Each location has one service window for customer access. A per unit cost for Ticket Office Terminals or Mobile Sales Devices, as it is entirely possible that KCATA and the other transit providers will partner with multiple municipal facilities to ensure greater accessibility to customers.

24. Q: Do the vehicles used for Freedom Paratransit service have internet connectivity and an open ethernet port?

A: The Freedom Paratransit vehicles are operated by a third-party operator. The fleet is a mix of cutaways, wheelchair accessible minivans and sedans. Most of the vehicles would have internet connection. As for port availability, it cannot be confirmed in a timely manner how many vehicles may not have open ports.

25. Q: The requirements and components are enumerated on page 20 of the Scope of Services. However, it is not clear where each component should be priced in the pricing form. Could KCATA please explain which component goes in each line item (Part A, Part B, Part D, etc.) of the pricing form?

A: Vendors should focus on pricing out the fare collection solution as listed on the price form. The price form has been updated to allow for vendors to enter the pricing of various components. KCATA requests that vendors elaborate on any other pricing or proposed methodology to launch a system that is different than what is outlined in the proposal. The narrative is an opportunity for vendors to differentiate their solution and offer additional information that can ensure a successful launch and ongoing operation of a fare collection system.

26. Q: Do the MAX BRT, Express buses, and local RideKC buses operate as a single shared fleet, or does each service have its own dedicated fleet?

A: All fixed-route buses are part of the shared fleet, except for red BRT buses (which only operate on Max BRT routes) and over-the-road coach buses that Johnson County uses for commuter routes.

27. Q: We request that KCATA remove the requirement for an MDT integration and replace it with three separate outcomes-based requirements as follows:

- The system shall provide a mechanism to display fare payment results directly to the operator. This may be accomplished through the existing MDT, providing a new DDU, or another means.
- The system shall provide a means to integrate operator-entered fare tally information (e.g., bikes, wheelchairs, etc.) with data collected by the fare payment system. This may be accomplished through an integration with the MDT or another means.

- The system shall provide a means for the operator to configure the Onboard Validator (e.g. change fare set, set route number and direction) or for any such configuration to handled automatically without operator involvement. This may be accomplished through an integration with the MDT, an integration with other onboard equipment, automatic updating from the Back Office, or another means.

A: If a vendor has a different means of achieving the same outcome, KCATA asks that a vendor denote the different approach and submit it as part of their proposal.

28. Q: Does KCATA use a centralized database, data warehouse, or business intelligence tool to consolidate and analyze data from multiple sources (e.g. ridership data, fare payment data, AVL data, APC data, etc.)?

A: KCATA does not currently utilize a centralized data warehouse; however, we do pull data from multiple sources for reporting and analysis. In addition to any standard or other required reporting available directly through the vendor systems, KCATA desires direct database access for reporting purposes using SQL, Crystal Reports, etc.

29. Q: There is a line item in the price form for "Part H. Platform Validation Installation Services" however, Platform Validators are only briefly mentioned once as a possible future component in the Scope of Services and do not appear in the list of requirements.

Please clarify whether Platform Validators are in scope or not? And if they are in scope, are they optional or required? If they are optional, our understanding is that they should not be included in the price form.

A: Platform validators are optional. This would be something KCATA, and regional partners would consider at high-volume bus stops and/or future rail/streetcar stops. Currently KCATA is inquiring of the potential cost of platform validators.

30. Q: Under Price Form C-1-B, we do not see the Ticket Office Terminals (TOT) on the price form. Although we believe the quantity to be two (2) TOTs since KCATA has one operational, in-person customer service and ticket sales location (East Village Transit Center) today and will be reopening the second location at KCATA Headquarters. However, for clarity, please amend the price form, including the needed quantity of TOTs or let us know which line to add this cost to on the current pricing form, and quantity of devices to include in that cost line.

A: The known quantity of KCATA operated TOTs is two. KCATA and its regional partners may partner with varying municipal locations to expand the reach and accessibility of the fare collection system. The pricing form has been updated to allow vendors to provide a per unit price.

31. Q: Under Price Form C-1-B, we do not see the Mobile Sales Devices (MSDs) - used as a portable alternative to the stationary TOT - in the price form. Please amend the price form, including the needed quantity of TOTs or let us know which line to add this cost to on the current pricing form, and quantity of devices to include in that cost line.

A: The known quantity of KCATA operated TOTs is two. KCATA and its regional partners may partner with varying municipal locations to expand the reach and accessibility of the fare collection system.

32. Q: The Specification notes under Section 3.3, that equipment shall include Onboard Validators, Ticket Office Terminals (TOTs), and Mobile Sales Devices (MSDs) at launch, but KCATA may choose to separately procure and implement Ticket Vending Machines or Platform Validators in the future. Handheld Ticket Validators may also be deployed in the future and have been included as an option in Section 6 Optional Scope of Work. Regarding the Platform Validators, Price Form C-1-B, notes "Part H. Platform Validation Installation Services," for four (4) units, but there is no corresponding device pricing and this seems to be in the Capital Expenditure section (implying in the Base Contract). Please clarify and/or modify for the proposers.

A: The price sheet has been updated. Please respond accordingly with per unit costs for the hardware offered by the vendor.

33. Q: Under Price Form C-1-B we do not see the Driver Display Units (DDUs) (optional) to display fare payment results and support operator inputs instead of integration with MDTs. Please include the pricing for the DDUs if still an option item for KCATA as well as the quantity needed.

A: The price form has been updated.

34. Q: Under Price Form C-1-B, we do not see the Handheld Ticket Validators (HHTV) (optional) to collect fares on paratransit. Please include the pricing for the HHTVs if still an option item for KCATA as well as the quantity needed.

A: This is only an optional item, and it has been added to the price form.

35. Q: Confirming that the optional scope of work requirements and pricing are not part of the evaluation criteria for award (since their inclusion is unknown).

A: Correct, the optional items are for KCATA and its regional partners to consider purchasing and not included as part of the cost criteria.

36. Q: Given that it is vital to the intended use of the deliverables, per the scope of work, that a mobile application with visual validation and a reliable process to address riders who do not have smartphones BE FULLY IMPLEMENTED on or prior to June 1, 2026. This means tested and ready for use. Kansas City, Missouri is hosting the 2026 World Cup and must have a functioning fare system, per the scope of work for this solicitation, operable, accessible and fully functional/reliable. Since this is such a short timeframe and mobile ticketing is a key component, it makes sense for KCATA to only entertain proposals that include at least three (3) successfully launched mobile ticketing application (app) and include references for these deployments as well as to ensure a reliable, quality experience for your riders that the app ratings (which should have more than 1,000 independent reviews) be at least at "B" grade, which equates to a rating of 4 out of 5 Stars in the Apple Store. This is key as it has been empirically shown that apps with less than a 4-Star rating (with a meaningful number of independent reviews) will be downloaded by mobile device users.

A: Duly noted.

37. Q: The Scope of Services gives Ticket Office Terminals as a required component, but then lists Mobile Sales Devices as an optional alternative. Our understanding is that proposers are required to include *either* TOT or MSD as a point of sale solution, but if TOTs are not included, then MSDs are not optional. This can lead to a confusing situation in which a vendor does not propose TOTs, but does include MSDs, and as MSDs are "optional" excludes them from pricing. This proposer's pricing would then be artificially lower than a proposer who includes TOTs, as TOTs are not optional and therefore included in pricing.

Please revise the status of the TOTs and/or MSDs in the Scope of Services and their respective inclusion in the pricing form to clarify.

A: The technology recommendation to ensure customers can buy fare media or reload fare media cards at distinct locations is completely up to the vendor. The new price form allows vendors to recommend a solution and a price for each unit.

38. Q: We understand that before submitting a proposal, the Proposer should make all investigations and examinations necessary to ascertain the site or other conditions and requirements affecting the full performance of the contract. This may not be practical in many cases, and any site visuals, especially regarding the bus installation areas (by bus type) would be appreciated.

A: Duly noted.

39. Q: Although mobile tickets were sold through Transit App, typically that firm contracts with a provider for mobile ticketing services. If that was the case, who was the mobile ticketing technology provider?

A: KCATA briefly had an independent, mobile ticketing provider up to going free fare. That vendor was never connected for fare sales with Transit App. KCATA utilizes Transit App as it's contracted, preferred mobile app for customer navigation and would like to have any vendor have native embedding with Transit App for fare sales. If a vendor does not have that capability, KCATA asks vendors to state mobile app capabilities and built out connections to other mobile apps, such as Transit App.

40. Q: Please provide the highlighted (in yellow) information missing from Page 16 of the KCATA RFP F25-5016-34B - Fare Payment System Specifications

A: KCATA and its regional partners operate 315 fixed-route buses. These buses are a variety of sizes of Gillig buses (30', 40' and 45'), as well as a series of cutaways and over-the-road coaches. All buses have a similar arrangement at the front of the bus with limited variability that offer multiple polls to connect validators and fare equipment. As for paratransit vehicles, KCATA partners with a third party contractor that operates the paratransit services with a variety of cutaways, wheelchair-accessible minivans and sedans; there are up to 200 vehicles that may be used to provide paratransit services and the maximum number of vehicles in peak service is 105 paratransit vehicles. KCATA's maintenance facility is located at 1200 E 18th Street, Kansas City, MO 64108.

41. Q: There are 400 On-Board Validators required for delivery but only 315 being installed. Are the remaining 85 validators being used as spares or is there another purpose for them (such as providing to other Regional RideKC Partners?

A: KCATA and its regional partners operate 315 vehicles. With a 10% spare ratio and a few extra for training purposes, the vendor should expect 350 validators. The 400 number was a placeholder to get an apples-to-apples comparison prior to understanding full capacity needs.

42. Q: According to the price proposal form (Attachment C-1-B), KCATA is requesting pricing for installation of 315 onboard validators and 400 validators. Does this mean that KCATA wants 85 spare validators (a roughly 27% spare ratio)? If there have been modifications to this number, please let us know the most updated amount.

A: KCATA and its regional partners have adjusted the amount to 350 validators.

43. Q: Can you provide a breakdown of the 311 fixed-route buses across KCATA, Johnson County Transit, and Unified Government Transit? What types of vehicles are being used?

A: KCATA and its regional partners operate 315 fixed-route buses. These buses are a variety of sizes of Gillig buses (30', 40' and 45'), as well as a series of cutaways and over-the-road coaches. All buses have a similar arrangement at the front of the bus with limited variability that offer multiple polls to connect validators and fare equipment. As for paratransit vehicles, KCATA partners with a third party contractor that operates the paratransit services with a variety of cutaways, wheelchair-accessible minivans and sedans; there are up to 200 vehicles that may be used to provide paratransit services and the maximum number of vehicles in peak service is 105 paratransit vehicles. KCATA's maintenance facility is located at 1200 E 18th Street, Kansas City, MO 64108.

44. Q: Can you elaborate on what KCATA is trying to achieve with respect to an integration with Vontas Mobile Data Terminals?

A: KCATA and its regional partners are checking to see if vendors have APIs established with Vontas or other driver display unit providers that may be needed to alert operators of fare acceptance/denial from the validator. If such a connection is not needed to notify operators, please state that this is the case.

45. Q: Are all 311 fixed-route buses equipped with routers with open ethernet ports?

A: All fixed-route buses are equipped with routers. KCATA cannot confirm that all 311 buses have open ethernet ports. If validators require a direct ethernet port connection, please state that as the case.

46. Q: Does "Extended Use Fare Media" refer to smart cards? And can you confirm that the order volume is 26,133?

A: Yes, "Extended Use Fare Media" is the same as a smart card or reloadable fare card. KCATA and its regional partners estimate that 26,133 pieces of fare media will be needed to ensure an ample amount for the estimated number of unique riders, as well as to maintain a stock of additional cards for future rides or replacements.

47. Q: KCATA states that "Equipment shall include Onboard Validators, Ticket Office Terminals (TOTs), and Mobile Sales Devices (MSDs) at launch, but KCATA may choose to separately procure and implement Ticket Vending Machines or Platform Validators in the future." Price Proposal Form (Attachment C-1-B) includes a line item for Platform Validation Installation Services - was that meant to be included? If so, should vendors also include pricing for 4 platform validators?

A: The updated price form allows for vendors to price out per unit costs for platform validators.

48. Q: Would KCATA be open to another cash digitization service and retail service than InComm? If so, would it be appropriate to respond to row 35 in the Pricing Proposal Form (Attachment C-1-B), "InComm Cash Digitization Fee" as "N/A" and provide pricing for the other service in an additional page?

A: Yes, KCATA and its regional partners are open to any provider/solution that can establish a “retail network” that gives riders access to reloading fare media.

49. Q: The RFP states, "Bank card fees can, at the proposing Contractors’ option, be included in the transaction fee." Can KCATA share a formula/method for how transaction fees inclusive of gateway, acquirer, interchange and other associated fees will be compared with those exclusive of such fees? We want to ensure that, during the grading of pricing proposals, the full cost of non-inclusive transaction fees is accounted for especially when compared to all-inclusive transaction fees.

A: KCATA has adjusted the price form to encourage vendors to state any and all know fees that KCATA and its regional partners may be expected to pay throughout the launch and ongoing operations of the fare collection system.

 # # END OF ADDENDUM # #

ADDENDUM NO. 1

RFP #F25-5016-34B
Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA) Fare Payment System

Proposers shall return this **RECEIPT OF ADDENDA** form when submitting their proposal. The form shall be signed and dated by an authorized representative of the firm. Failure to submit this form may deem the Proposer non-responsive.

We hereby acknowledge that the following Addenda noted below were received.

Addendum #1 dated October 23, 2025 Date Received ________________________________

Addendum # 2 dated ________________ Date Received: ______________________________

Company Name ____ Date ________________________

Address/City/State/Zip ____

Authorized Signature ___________________________________

Printed Name ___________________________________

Telephone ___________________________________

Email ___________________________________