

NOTICE TO PROPOSERS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CHAMPAIGN-URBANA MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT (MTD) will be receiving proposals in accordance with Requests for Proposals #2024-006 for the successful deployment of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) System and relevant implementation services until 2:00 PM (CST), February 3, 2025.

Proposals shall be submitted electronically to procurement@mtd.org. Any proposals received after the time and date noted herein will not be considered and will not be opened. MTD reserves the right to accept any or any part or parts thereof or to reject any and all proposals received.

Any contract resulting from these proposals is subject to financial assistance contracts between MTD, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). MTD will be bound by the terms and conditions of the proposal only to the extent funds from whatever source are available.

MTD also hereby notifies proposers that they affirmatively ensure that all Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, as defined by the United States Government, are afforded full opportunity to submit statements in response to this RFP and will not knowingly discriminate against any proposer upon the grounds of gender, race, color, or national origin in the consideration of award of the contract.

The full RFP document may be obtained by contacting Victoria Carrington at procurement@mtd.org or (217) 384-8188.



Date: December 18, 2024
 To: Potential Proposers
 Subject: Addendum No. 1 to the Bidding Documents for RFP No. 2024-006: ERP/EAM Software System & Implementation Services
 Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (MTD)

Addendum No. 1 becomes a part of proposal documents and modifies the original request for proposals

CLARIFICATION / ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Addendum No. 1 includes the link for attendance to the optional pre-proposal conference, scheduled for January 7, 2025, at 10:00 AM (CST), see below.

The pre-proposal conference will be held virtually via Microsoft Teams on Tuesday, January 7, 2025, at 10:00 AM (CST).

Attendees can join by clicking: [Pre-Proposal Conference Meeting Link](#)

Meeting ID: 260 706 428 045 Passcode: Qb9Cy9PN

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies the table in Section A.11 to include additional required file formats for Attachments 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12 as follows:

RFP Section	Attachment/Document	Required File Format
B.1	Attachment 2: Scope of Proposal	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.1	Attachment 3: Functional Requirements	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.2	Attachment 4: Software Background	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.2	Attachment 5: Detailed Software Products	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.2	Attachment 6: Hosted Requirements	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.2	Attachment 7: SaaS	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.2	Attachment 8: Proposed Service Level Agreement	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.3	Attachment 9: Professional Services Background	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.3	Attachment 10: Reference Form	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.3	Attachment 11: Level of Effort	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.3	Attachment 12: Project Management Expectations	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.3	Attachment 13: Deliverable Expectations	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.3	Attachment 14: Interfaces	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.3	Attachment 15: Data Conversion	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)
B.4	Attachment 17: Cost	Microsoft Excel (.xls or .xlsx)



MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.2 Attachment 2: Scope of Proposal by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet, as follows:

A.2 Attachment 2: Scope of Proposal

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.4 Attachment 4: Software Backgrounds by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet, as follows:

A.4 Attachment 4: Software Background

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 removes Section C.5 Attachment 5: Detailed Software Products by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet, as follows:

A.5 Attachment 5: Detailed Software Products

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.6 Attachment 6: Hosted Requirements by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet as follows:

A.6 Attachment 6: Hosted Requirements

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.7 Attachment 7: SaaS by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet as follows:

A.7 Attachment 7: SaaS

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)



MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.8 Attachment 8: Proposed Service Level Agreement by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet as follows:

A.8 Attachment 8: Proposed Service Level Agreement

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.9 Attachment 9: Professional Services Background by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet as follows:

A.9 Attachment 9: Professional Services Background

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.10 Attachment 10: Reference Form by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet as follows:

A.10 Attachment 10: Reference Form

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.12 Attachment 12: Project Management Expectations by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet as follows:

A.12 Attachment 12: Project Management Expectations

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 modifies Section C.13 Attachment 13: Deliverable Expectations by replacing the table with an Excel worksheet as follows:

A.13 Attachment 13: Deliverable Expectations

(See Separate Excel Workbook: *RFP #2024-006: Attachments*)



CLARIFICATION / ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Addendum No. 1 includes an Excel Workbook titled, '*RFP #2024-006: Attachments*' to be used to complete Attachments 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 13.

Proposers shall use the attached Excel workbook, titled '*RFP #2024-006: Attachments*' to complete the following attachments, rather than using the PDF versions that were provided in the original RFP.

Proposers shall use the pages originally provided in the RFP to complete attachments 1 and 16.



Date: December 23, 2024

To: Potential Proposers

Subject: Addendum No. 2 to the Bidding Documents for RFP No. 2024-006: ERP/EAM Software System & Implementation Services

Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (MTD)

Addendum No. 2 becomes a part of proposal documents and modifies the original request for proposals

PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

Addendum No. 2 modifies Section A.8 Procurement Schedule to allow proposers additional time to for submission preparations, as follows:

Procurement Schedule	
December 16, 2024	RFP Release
January 7, 2025	OPTIONAL Virtual Pre-proposal Conference – 10:00 AM (CST)
January 10, 2025	Proposer Written Questions & Clarifications Due – 2:00 PM (CST)
January 15, 2025	Responses to Written Questions & Clarifications Release
February 3, 2025 February 17, 2025	Proposals Due – 2:00 PM (CST)
February 11-13, 2025 February 25-27, 2025	Conduct Initial Interviews with all responsive proposers
March 7, 2025 March 21, 2025	Notify proposers elevated to implementation interview and software demonstration phase of evaluation
March 18-20, 2025 March 25-27, 2025 April 1-3, 2025 April 8-10, 2025 April 15-17, 2025	Conduct remote implementation interviews and software demonstrations with elevated proposers (week one – financials, week two – HR/payroll, week three – EAM/other)
April 8, 2025 April 29, 2024	Notify proposers elevated to discovery phase of evaluation
April 22-24, 2025 May 13-15, 2025	Conduct discovery sessions with elevated proposers
April 25, 2025 May 16, 2025	Notice of selection and enter contract negotiations
May- June 2025	Present final contract to MTD Board for approval and execute final contract



Procurement Schedule	
June 2025	Begin implementation

Addendum No. 2 modifies Section A.10 Proposal Submission Instructions, as follows:

A.2.1 Proposals are to be submitted electronically via email to procurement@mtd.org by ~~February 3, 2025~~ **February 17, 2025**, at **2:00 PM CST**. Late submissions will not be accepted.

CLARIFICATION / ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Addendum No. 2 modifies Section A.4 Notice to Proposers to clarify the intent of this project, as follows:

A.2.2 In the event that all RFP requirements are not met with products and services provided by one (1) firm, proposers are encouraged to partner with another firm to submit a joint proposal. Failure to meet all requirements will not disqualify a proposer, **though proposals which do not contain the products and services as described herein will not be considered for evaluation.** The agencies will evaluate each proposal to determine if the proposed **ERP/EAM** solution fits the agency's needs.



Date: January 14, 2025
 To: Potential Proposers
 Subject: Addendum No. 3 to the Bidding Documents for RFP No. 2024-006: ERP/EAM Software System & Implementation Services
 Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (MTD)

Addendum No. 3 becomes a part of proposal documents and modifies the original request for proposals

PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

Addendum No. 3 modifies Section A.8 Procurement Schedule and Addendum #2 to allow the agencies additional time to respond to the volume of questions received, as follows:

Procurement Schedule	
December 16, 2024	RFP Release
January 7, 2025	OPTIONAL Virtual Pre-proposal Conference – 10:00 AM (CST)
January 10, 2025	Proposer Written Questions & Clarifications Due – 2:00 PM (CST)
January 15, 2025 January 17, 2025	Responses to Written Questions & Clarifications Release
February 17, 2025	Proposals Due – 2:00 PM (CST)
February 25-27, 2025	Conduct Initial Interviews with all responsive proposers
March 21, 2025	Notify proposers elevated to implementation interview and software demonstration phase of evaluation
April 1-3, 2025 April 8-10, 2025 April 15-17, 2025	Conduct remote implementation interviews and software demonstrations with elevated proposers (week one – financials, week two – HR/payroll, week three – EAM/other)
April 29, 2024	Notify proposers elevated to discovery phase of evaluation
May 13-15, 2025	Conduct discovery sessions with elevated proposers
May 16, 2025	Notice of selection and enter contract negotiations
May-June 2025	Present final contract to MTD Board for approval and execute final contract



Procurement Schedule	
June 2025	Begin implementation



Date: January 17, 2025
To: Potential Proposers
Subject: Addendum No. 4 to the Bidding Documents for RFP No. 2024-006: ERP/EAM Software System & Implementation Services
Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (MTD)

Addendum No. 4 becomes a part of proposal documents and modifies the original request for proposals

WRITTEN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS RECEIVED

Addendum No. 4 includes the responses to the questions and clarifications submitted in response to the RFP.

PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

Q1. Will the agency provide a one-month extension to the due date of 2/3/25, to provide more gap between questions answered and the submission date?

A1. The agencies have extended the proposal deadline to February 17, 2025, see Addendum #2 for modification of the procurement schedule.

Q2. Since the answers to questions won't be released until 1/15/25, may we respectfully request at least a two-week extension of the current due date?

A2. The agencies have extended the proposal deadline to February 17, 2025, see Addendum #2 for modification of the procurement schedule.

CONTRACT

Q3. What is a cooperative contract, a single contract for all four projects? How does it represent itself to A. software provider, B. software implementor, and C. if the software provider & software implementor are the same vendor?

A3. A cooperative contract in this context refers to a procurement arrangement where multiple agencies collaborate to select the same system(s) and implementer(s) through a shared RFP process, but each agency ultimately enters into its own separate contract with the selected vendor. This ensures consistency in selection while allowing flexibility for each agency's individual needs.

A. The cooperative contract means the software provider will engage with four separate agencies under separate contracts but for the same selected system. The provider must deliver a unified solution that meets the needs of all participating agencies, ensuring compatibility and standardization while accommodating agency-specific configurations where necessary.

B. Similar to the software provider, the implementor will support all four agencies through separate contracts. The implementor must align implementation timelines, strategies, and resource allocation to support each agency's deployment schedule while maintaining consistency across implementations.

C. If the same vendor provides both the software and implementation services, they assume dual roles under the cooperative contract. They must demonstrate the capacity to deliver and implement the system across all four agencies while managing separate contractual



obligations. Coordination of software delivery and implementation must reflect the staggered timelines and unique requirements of each agency.

Q4. Will there be a unique contract between the successful proposer and each agency?

A4. While the products and services will be selected collaboratively, each agency expects to enter into a separate contract with the selected vendor(s). This allows each agency to define its specific scope and cost, tailored to its individual needs.

Q5. Please elaborate on this statement from Section A.1 of the RFP: *The agencies intend to select the same system(s) and implementers(s) as MTD and implement the system(s) subsequent to MTD through a cooperative contract. Specifically, how does it relate to this statement from Section A.3 of the RFP: It is expected that each agency will contract separately for software and related professional services, but all will follow the same scope (though MTD and RMTD will not need HR or payroll functions, see below for additional detail).*

A5. The statements in the RFP reflect the cooperative procurement structure and the intent for consistency while accommodating the individual needs of each agency:

- A. The agencies will collaboratively select the same software system(s) and implementation vendor(s) through the RFP process. This ensures a standardized solution across all agencies, which promotes alignment in functionality and facilitates shared discussions and improvements.
- B. While the products and services will be selected collaboratively, each agency will enter into a separate contract with the selected vendor(s). This allows each agency to define its specific scope and cost, tailored to its individual needs.
- C. The agencies will follow the same general scope outlined in the RFP. However, variations are accounted for based on agency-specific requirements. For instance: MTD and RMTD do not require HR or payroll functionality, so their scope and pricing will exclude those modules; Connect Transit and MetroLINK require HR and payroll functions included in the scope and related cost.
- D. MTD will implement the system first, with the other agencies implementing subsequently. This phased approach ensures that lessons learned from MTD's implementation can inform and benefit the later implementations. Additionally, having the same system enables the agencies to work together as a "local user community," sharing insights, discussing issues, and proposing changes collaboratively.

Q6. If there are separate contracts, will MTD's initial contract include the scope and pricing for software and implementation elements that the three other agencies will eventually derive benefit from (e.g. SaaS costs associated with hosting the application + the setup of the application in a cloud environment)?

A6. MTD's initial contract will not include the costs or scope for the other three agencies' agreements. Each agency will have its own separate agreement with the selected proposer. The cost proposal submitted through the RFP process will serve as a baseline for these agreements, ensuring consistent pricing and scope definitions. However, each agency's final costs will be determined based on its specific needs and implementation requirements. The primary benefit of this cooperative procurement lies in the value of all agencies adopting the same system. This provides opportunities for creating a "local user community" where agencies can collaborate, discuss issues, and propose changes collectively; leveraging shared knowledge and experiences to optimize system use and implementation; and facilitating system enhancements or upgrades that may benefit the agencies.



Q7. Do the agencies have budgets in mind for the project? If so, please share those thresholds.

A7. The agencies have established internal budgets for this project based on preliminary assessments and anticipated needs. However, these thresholds will not be disclosed as part of the RFP process to encourage vendors to submit competitive proposals that reflect the true scope of their solution and services. It is important to note that each agency will have different numbers of users, as well as varying financial and fleet information, which may impact the cost structure. Proposers are encouraged to provide detailed, transparent cost proposals tailored to the requirements of each agency as outlined in the RFP.

IMPLEMENTATION

Q8. Are proposers required to hold software implementation certification?

A8. No, proposers are not required to hold a software implementation certification. However, references demonstrating previous client experience with similar projects are required and will be used to evaluate the proposer’s qualifications and capability to successfully implement the proposed solution.

Q9. When does MTD anticipate year one of the subscription to start (e.g. the day of project kickoff, or after the system goes live)?

A9. MTD anticipates that year one of the subscription will begin after the system goes live and is fully operational. This approach ensures that the subscription period aligns with the system's active use, providing the maximum value for the subscription investment. If a different start date for the subscription is proposed or required by the vendor (e.g., at project kickoff), it should be clearly detailed in the proposal, along with any associated cost implications.

Q10. Section A.15 of the RFP lists the EAM function be ready for implementation October 2025 – June 2025, please confirm there is a typo error, and the EAM function duration should be October 2025 – June 2026.

A10. Yes, the project timeline should be as follows:

Phase	Functions	Duration
1	Finance & Budget	June 2025 – June 2026
2	EAM	October 2025 – June 2026

Q11. In reference to the table in Section A.15, does the implementation duration for Phase 1 (June 2025 to June 2026) refer to the go-live date or the period for management services?

A11. The implementation duration for Phase 1 (June 2025 to June 2026) as referenced in the table in Section A.15 is intended to reflect the timeline for achieving go-live. Management services are not included in the RFP scope or timeline.

Q12. What is the reasoning for having EAM phase of the project start four months after ERP phase?

A12. The reasoning for starting the EAM phase of the project four months after the ERP phase is to ensure a more focused and sequential approach to implementation, which helps in the following ways:

- A. Staggering the start times allows the project team and stakeholders to concentrate their efforts on the ERP phase first, addressing foundational aspects like financials and chart of accounts, procurement, and HR (if applicable) without spreading resources too thin.
- B. The ERP system serves as a foundational platform for many business processes that the EAM system will rely on, such as procurement, inventory management, and financial reporting. By starting the ERP phase earlier, MTD can establish core processes and data structures that will facilitate seamless integration with the EAM system.



- C. Separating the phases reduces the risk of complications that could arise from simultaneous design and implementation of two complex systems. It also allows for lessons learned during the ERP phase to inform the EAM phase, improving efficiency and minimizing errors.

Proposers are welcome but not required to propose alternative project timelines, including a schedule where all phases of the project begin at the same time.

Q13. How does MTD foresee integration design between these two systems based on these staggered start times (i.e. EAM four months after ERP stage)?

A13. MTD anticipates the following approach to integration design:

- A. During the ERP phase, the project team will define the integration points between the ERP and EAM systems (e.g., asset acquisition workflows, work order management, and inventory tracking). These integration requirements will be documented and used to inform the EAM implementation.
- B. Although the EAM phase starts later, the integration design process will begin during the ERP phase. Cross-phase collaboration between ERP and EAM teams will ensure alignment on data structures, workflows, and system requirements.
- C. Once the ERP system is operational and the EAM system enters its implementation phase, incremental testing of integration points will be conducted to ensure data flows and process handoffs are functioning as intended.

Q14. Given the agencies’ intention to remain on the same system, how would you prioritize shared vs. agency-specific features?

A14. The agencies would prioritize shared features that can be standardized across all agencies to ensure consistency, efficiency, and ease of maintenance. Agency-specific features would be prioritized next, ensuring they align with the unique needs of each agency while maintaining compatibility with the shared system. The balance would be carefully managed to ensure that both shared and agency-specific requirements are met without compromising the overall integrity and performance of the system.

Q15. What is the plan for leveraging lessons learned from MTD’s implementation to benefit subsequent agencies?

A15. The intent is to leverage lessons learned from MTD’s implementation by thoroughly analyzing the successes and challenges encountered throughout the process. This includes identifying best practices, optimizing workflows, and addressing any issues that arose. These insights should be applied to subsequent agency implementations to streamline processes, minimize risks, and enhance overall efficiency. Additionally, approaches should be adjusted based on feedback from MTD to ensure that subsequent implementations benefit from a more refined and effective process.

Q16. Please provide the total number of users for each agency broken out by administration/maintenance staff/contractors that will be using the system.

A16.

	MTD	RMTD	MetroLINK	Connect Transit
Administration	42	6	22	38
Maintenance	14	7	18	8
Contractors	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	56	13	40	46



Q17. Will the current system be transitioned to read-only mode for historical data access, or will it be fully decommissioned?

A17. The approach to the current system post-implementation will depend on the final solution and agency requirements. At this time, the agencies expect to maintain access to the databases containing current system data, but to lose access to current system's user front-end. However, the agencies remain open to recommendations from proposers regarding the decommissioning process, including best practices for transitioning to the new system. If a complete decommissioning is proposed, it should include a plan for how historical data will be retained and accessed to meet operational and compliance needs.

Q18. Do the agencies expect the selected proposer to train superusers, who will then train the end users, or will the selected proposer provide in-depth training for superusers along with a basic overview of training for the end users?

A18. The agencies expect the selected proposer to assist with end-user training. At a minimum, this will involve providing full, in-depth training to core agency superusers, as well as delivering end-user training materials. The agencies understand that the cost structures for different training options may vary and expect proposers to include a range of training options in their proposed training plan. The final decision on training options will be determined through the evaluation process.

Q19. Should cost for training be combined as one portion or broken down?

A19. One portion.

Q20. Are the agencies expecting post-implementation support?

A20. The agencies expect some level of assistance after go-live, particularly with the management of help-desk type functions listed in Section A.16.6. Proposers shall include a minimum of sixty (60) days of post-go-live support in their proposal to ensure a smooth transition and address any immediate issues.

ACCOUNTING

Q21. How is the complexity of tracking financial information across different funding sources currently handled?

A21. Currently, the complexity of tracking financial information across different funding sources is managed through the existing financial system, Excel spreadsheets, and supporting processes. Each agency uses specific workflows, account structures, and reporting mechanisms to ensure accurate allocation, tracking, and reporting of funds in compliance with funding source requirements. However, the agencies recognize the challenges and limitations of the current system and processes, which is a key driver for seeking a new ERP solution that can streamline and enhance these capabilities. The new system is expected to provide improved tools for managing multiple funding sources, offering greater efficiency, accuracy, and compliance.

Q22. What role the agencies see the new system playing in automating reporting for federally and state-funded projects?

A22. The agencies anticipate the new system playing a pivotal role in automating reporting for federally and state-funded projects. Specifically, the system is expected to:

- A. Streamline data collection and reporting by automatically compiling data from various modules and sources to generate accurate and comprehensive reports for federally and state funded projects, which presumably will be driven through grant and project management features in the chart of accounts.
- B. Ensure compliance using tools and templates designed to meet specific reporting



requirements and standards set by federal and state agencies, reducing manual effort and the risk of errors.

- C. Enhance real-time visibility with dashboards and reporting features that offer real-time insights into funding allocations, expenditures, and project performance and milestones.
- D. Facilitate audits and transparency in maintaining detailed records and audit trails that simplify the process of demonstrating compliance during audits and reviews.
- E. Support configuration of reports to adapt to changing requirements or specific needs of individual funding programs.

Q23. Please provide the current chart of account structure.

A23. Refer to Section A.13.1 and the attached Excel workbook titled “MTD – RFP #2024-006 – Chart of Accounts” for each agency’s chart of accounts listing.

Q24. Please provide examples of inefficiencies in the current chart of accounts which aim to be resolved.

A24. The current system has several limitations, including restrictions on when and how new accounts can be added, the inability to edit account information (such as account names), and the lack of functionality to reopen closed years. Additionally, it does not support departmental self-service for account management. The system also lacks a built-in workflow approval process for creating new accounts, requiring chart of account changes to be requested and approved externally, typically through email communication.

BUDGETING

Q25. What challenges are faced while using Excel for budgeting and forecasting?

A25. Budget challenges with the current system are primarily due to limited functionality resulting in highly manual processes, such as the allocation of miles, hours, etc. for cost distribution; estimating broad changes like rate adjustments, wage increases, and pension contributions; budget versioning; and workflow approval of changes.

Q26. Please elaborate on how multiple budgets are managed, such as IDOT operating grant requests.

A26. The agencies manage multiple budgets using Excel as the current system lacks the functionality for multiple budgets.

Q27. What specific insights or analytics are expected to be gained from the new system's budgeting capabilities?

A27. The agencies expect the new system will include the ability to easily handle budget versions and track budget requests and changes in a central location; the capability for program budgeting and easy integration or uploading of transit service plans which drive much of the agencies’ budgets; and robust budget monitoring functionality.

Q28. Are the agencies planning to use budgeting functionality within the new system and if so, will the budgeting process/tool serve as an absolute or advisory?

A28. Yes, the agencies plan to use budgeting functionality within the new system, including budget controls with the ability to assign permissions for certain users to override the controls with electronic approval based on spending limits. The agencies anticipate using the budgeting functionality within the new system to produce and revise an authoritative annual budget.



PROCUREMENT & ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

Q29. How are contracts currently managed and approvals for purchase orders tracked?

A29. The current system does not have the functionality to manage contracts resulting in highly manual contract management processes using Excel (Connect Transit and MetroLINK use Bonfire and Ion Wave software, respectively, as noted in Attachment 14). Purchase orders are maintained in the current system, though purchase orders are not used consistently amongst all purchases. Purchase orders for non-maintenance purchases are requested manually through email communication due to system access limitations.

Q30. What features in the workflow automation for procurement are being requested by the agencies?

A30. Refer to Attachment 3. The agencies anticipate best practice procurement functionality from a modern ERP system. Key to this is for the ERP to integrate with the EAM for work order, inventory, and asset functionalities that will automate procurements to replenish inventories and allow for requisitions to be created for asset components as needed.

Q31. How would the agencies assess the impact of vendor self-service capabilities in current processes?

A31. The current system lacks vendor self-service functionality. All vendor communications and registrations are manually entered into the system. Connect Transit and MetroLINK use separate a contract management system (Bonfire and Ion Wave, respectively) which allows for vendor registration, but the system does not interface with the current system.

Q32. Does the scope of this project include a complete procurement suite (e.g., self-service, purchasing, sourcing, contracts, supplier portal, software quality management, etc.)?

A32. Refer to Attachment 3. The agencies intend for procurement functionality to include the procure-to-pay process from requisition to payment, contracting, and contract management.

TREASURY

Q33. What are the current challenges with integrating fare collection data into treasury management?

A33. The current challenges arise from the need to handle cash (for fares paid in cash) and to count the cash on a regular basis. RMTD and MTD have mobile fare payment apps (Token Transit) and are currently acting to move more riders to using these apps; however, cash fares will continue to be accepted.

Q34. Please detail the current bank reconciliation process and expectations for its automation.

A34. Refer to Attachment 3. The agencies use the current system's bank reconciliation module, supplemented by Excel (MTD uses Square for credit card reconciliation). Reconciliation happens weekly or monthly depending on the agency. The agencies are looking for a modern ERP application that will allow them to adopt best practices for bank reconciliation automation, such as exception-based reconciliation.

Q35. Do the agencies prefer to have either/or:

A. A centralized cashiering process where all payments are made through one software with real-time, bi-directional integration back to other software; or

B. A decentralized cashiering process where each department/software records their own payments and updates the financial system?

A35. The agencies have limited cashiering touchpoints at this time (selling transit passes and, for MetroLINK, a store). A decentralized process would likely sufficiently meet the needs of recording transactions at the summary level in the ERP.



Q36. If the agencies intend to adopt a centralized cashiering approach, please specify the applications for which the new cashiering system should process payments.

A36. See response to A35.

Q37. Please provide the number of total users, including supervisors, that would be accessing only the new cashiering/POS module (i.e., Receiving payments for the financial A/R system, miscellaneous payments, and any users associated with the answer above.)

A37.

	MTD	RMTD	MetroLINK	Connect Transit
Total # Users	24	9	22	20

Q38. Please list the agencies current POS equipment and model that the cashiering solution should integrate with or would the agencies like additional POS equipment to be included in proposals (e.g., receipt printers, scanners, cash drawers, check imaging, MICR devices, encrypted credit card swipe, EMV/chip/tap-to-pay devices)?

A38.

	MTD	RMTD	MetroLINK	Connect Transit
POS Software	Square	Heartland	Shopify	Square

If proposers offer a POS system that integrates with or is part of their ERP solution, they should include equipment options and associated costs in their proposals. This may include items such as receipt printers, scanners, cash drawers, check imaging devices, MICR devices, encrypted credit card swipes, EMV/chip/tap-to-pay devices, or other relevant equipment.

Q39. What credit processors do the agencies currently use?

A39.

	MTD	RMTD	MetroLINK	Connect Transit
Credit Processor	Square	Heartland	Shopify/Vantiv	Square

Q40. Do the agencies envision the new cashiering solution serving as its Online Customer Payment Portal? If so, which applications should it support for online payment processing?

A40. At this time, the agencies do not need a customer payment portal.

Q41. Do the agencies prefer for the new cashiering solution to create an Image Cash Letter (ICL) containing check images for deposit and sent to the bank? Is so, what bank?

A41. At this time, the agencies do not require the need to create an ICL.

Q42. Do the agencies have a multi-check scanning process in place for recording checks and invoices in batch? If not, should this be included in proposals? What is the annual volume that the agencies would scan using this process?

A42. At this time, the agencies do not require a multi-check scanning process. While it is not a requirement, the agencies are open to exploring options that proposers may offer for such a process. Proposers are encouraged to include details of their multi-check scanning capabilities in their proposals. The agencies estimate less than 10,000 check transactions annually, each.

Q43. Do the agencies have scenarios where different departments/agencies need to submit end-of-day receipt summary information? If so, would the agencies like to automate that process?



A43. The agencies do have different departments that submit end-of-day receipt summaries included with the daily deposit. The agencies anticipate implementing process automation where possible.

CUSTOMER BILLING

Q44. How are grant receivables currently managed?

A44. Currently, receivables must be created manually in the current system. The agencies manage grant-related spending by monitoring invoices during processing and using Excel to track associated costs.

Q45. How is Medicaid billing for paratransit services currently managed?

A45. Currently, bills are created manually in the current system and manually sent to the Medicaid provider.

Q46. What functionality is envisioned for a central customer database to improve billing operations?

A46. Refer to Attachment 3. The agencies anticipate a central customer database that can be used for all receivables issued.

Q47. Are the agencies requiring the new system integrate with the agency's CAD/AVL systems and automation of grant reimbursement processes?

A47. Refer to Attachment 14 for interface requirements. The agencies anticipate implementing best practices for grant reimbursement automation.

ASSET MANAGEMENT

Q48. Please provide the number of active assets and its types.

A48.

	MTD	RMTD	MetroLINK	Connect Transit
# Assets	890	3500	450	260
Facility Assets	400			
Facilities/Land	20			
Shelters/Kiosks	185			
Vehicles	180		100	71
Other Equipment	105			

The types of assets include facility assets, facilities and land, shelters and kiosks, vehicles, and other equipment.

Q49. Please share the asset hierarchy details (parent and child).

A49. The agencies currently do not utilize an asset hierarchy (parent-child relationships) due to the limited functionality of the asset management module in the existing system. As a result, current parent/child asset relationships are minimal and handled manually through notes on the asset records. If asset hierarchies are included in the proposed system, proposers are encouraged to provide detailed information on how the system supports and manages these hierarchies, as well as the benefits this functionality would offer to the agencies.

Q50. Do the agencies intend to track facilities assets and maintenance (e.g., bus stop shelters, fleet garages)? If so, please provide a list of the assets.

A50. Yes, the agencies intend to track facilities assets and maintenance. Asset lists may be provided at a later time.



Q51. In addition to fleet, what types of assets will the agencies require the EAM to track?

A51. The agencies expect the ability to track land, facilities, facility improvements, asset improvements, machinery, equipment, and component units (e.g., laptops, HVAC units, garage doors, heaters, bus stops, bus shelters, fareboxes, etc.).

Q52. How is asset maintenance currently performed and what is the strategy?

A52. The agencies manage asset maintenance using the current system's work order functionalities. The system generates a forecast report that tracks time and mileage to indicate when inspections or repairs are due. The agencies anticipate using the new system to implement best practices for streamlining asset maintenance and work orders.

Q53. Do the agencies require approvals for work orders?

A53. Refer to Attachment 3.

Q54. Do the agencies have rebuildable assets?

A54. Yes, the agencies have rebuildable assets and expect the new system to include rebuildable assets.

Q55. What limitations are faced with the current system in tracking assets and maintenance activities?

A55. The current system lacks many modern capabilities for tracking assets and maintenance. Among others, in the current system, there is no unified asset record – the "fixed asset" record and the asset record in the maintenance module are separate and any changes (or new assets) must be recorded in both places manually. Procurement is also not integrated, so new assets must be identified manually. The current system lacks the ability to attach information to asset records such as warranty information. Excel spreadsheets are utilized for tracking outside of the current system.

Q56. Please explain how robust work order and inventory functionalities could support maintenance teams.

A56. The agencies currently struggle with a work order system that allows for the flexibility of scheduling and prioritizing work orders, tracking progress and history, tying work orders to inventory, and tracking time on work orders. Robust work order and inventory functionalities could greatly enhance the efficiency of maintenance teams by enabling flexible scheduling and prioritization of work orders, tracking progress and history, and linking work orders directly to inventory. Additionally, the ability to track time spent on work orders would provide valuable insights for resource planning and optimization. The current system presents several challenges, including cumbersome processes for creating and closing work orders and a lack of critical tracking information. Moreover, the absence of electronic inspection forms requires all records to be maintained on paper, adding inefficiencies. The agencies anticipate that proposers with experience in modern systems can provide valuable guidance and recommendations to address these limitations and improve overall maintenance operations.

CUSTOMER SERVICE

Q57. What are the current methods for tracking customer complaints, commendations, and claims?

A57. The agencies currently use a combination of the current system and Excel to manually enter and track customer complaints, commendations, and claims which are received through phone or email. For larger claims, the information is forwarded to a third-party administrator for further handling and processing.



Q58. How are reports for NTD currently prepared and what improvements are expected?

A58. The agencies prepare NTD reports manually by exporting and coding data from the current system and the agencies' computer-aided dispatch (CAD) systems in Excel. The agencies anticipate that a future system can allow for more automated coding of cost information to the relevant NTD reporting categories by tying these items to the chart of accounts and more easily integrating CAD data.

HR & PAYROLL

Q59. What systems are currently used to enter electronic timesheets?

A59.

	MTD	RMTD	MetroLINK	Connect Transit
Administrative Staff	Paycom	Paper Timesheets	Exception-based	Exception-based
Hourly Employees	Paycom	Paper Timesheets	Paper Timesheets	FleetNet
Bus Drivers	CAD System Import/ MTD intranet	CAD System Import/ Paper Timesheets	CAD System Import	Paper Timesheets

Q60. Please elaborate on inefficiencies in current HR processes that require manual intervention.

A60. The agencies anticipate the new system facilitating transactional workflow, reporting, and the elimination of paper forms and to include employee self-service.

Q61. What features in a centralized HR system would improve employee performance tracking and certification management?

A61. Refer to Attachment 3. The agencies have established goals and requirements for tracking performance and certifications and expect vendors to provide solutions to meet their needs. Key features anticipated in the new system include workflow approvals for personnel actions, automation of some recruitment/hiring processes (such as minimum qualifications review), and employee self-service.

Q62. How is the new system expected to streamline time-entry processes and payroll calculations?

A62. The agencies expect to eliminate all paper timecards and allow for employee self-service of time entry and absences. Additionally, the agencies expect multiple time entry options, including "clocking in" time entry and "exception-based" time entry, and for the time approval process to have workflow.

Q63. If the ERP software does not include a built-in HR and payroll solution, is it still necessary to have HR and payroll functionality integrated into the ERP system?

A63. If the ERP software does not include a built-in HR and payroll solution and would need to be integrated into the ERP, this requirement must be clearly communicated within the proposal submission. HR and payroll functionality are requirements of the project scope for Connect Transit and MetroLINK.

Q64. Are solutions required to have integration with human capital management (HCM) software and the existing Paycom software (i.e., only for Connect Transit and MetroLINK)?

A64. Yes, the agencies expect the new system to integrate with HCM software and MTD's and RMTD's existing HCM solutions (Paycom and Ceridian, respectively).

Q65. Please provide the number of payroll transactions (i.e., # employees x # monthly payrolls) that the agencies are posting monthly?

A65.

	MTD	RMTD	MetroLINK	Connect Transit
# Employees	400	152	150	180



Pay Period	Bi-Weekly (26x/y)	Bi-Weekly (26x/y)	Weekly (52x/y)	Bi-Weekly (26x/y)
Trans/Mo.	867	306	630	360

DATA CONVERSION

Q66. Which datasets are critical for conversion, considering the extensive Excel use in current operations?

A66. Refer to Attachment 15.

Q67. Attachment 15 reflects data conversions going back seven (7) years, does that include both open and closed transactions?

A67. The data conversions reflected in Attachment 15 include both open and closed transactions from the past seven (7) years. However, the agencies are open to recommendations to proceed with reducing the number of years of data or other options, provided that any approach complies with the state-mandated record retention requirements. If proposers are unable to meet this requirement, the agencies would appreciate clear communication of such limitations in the proposal to ensure alignment and proper evaluation.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Q68. Will the agencies consider allowing separate proposals for the EAM solution apart from an ERP solution as long as the EAM software interfaces to the requirements for the ERP?

A68. Refer to Addendum #2. The agencies encourage prospective proposers which provide only either EAM or ERP solutions, to partner with other solution providers to jointly propose a comprehensive solution in response to our RFP. The agencies' goal is to identify a vendor team or team of vendors that can deliver an integrated ERP and EAM solution in alignment with the needs of the agencies.

Q69. Regarding Section A.4.1, to ensure delivery of the highest-quality solutions, would the agencies consider accepting proposals from vendors specializing exclusively in EAM requirements? Is it mandatory for proposers to address both EAM and ERP requirements?

A69. Yes, the agencies would consider accepting proposals from vendors specializing exclusively in EAM requirements, provided that such vendors partner with an ERP vendor and submit a joint proposal. Proposals containing EAM or ERP solutions, exclusively, will not be evaluated or considered for award. To be eligible, proposers must submit a combined solution that addresses both EAM and ERP requirements as specified in the RFP.

Q70. If the agencies consider allowing proposals exclusively for either ERP or EAM solutions, how should vendors complete Attachments 3, 4, and 5? Should the focus be solely on the ERP or EAM requirements?

A70. The goal of this solicitation is to procure an integrated ERP and EAM solution. Proposal submissions shall include both ERP and EAM software solutions and implementation services. Proposals which are incomplete and/or missing key components required within this RFP may be rejected from further consideration due to non-responsiveness. Only the format described in the RFP and the attachments included with the RFP will be accepted as compliant for the submitted proposal unless otherwise stated in an addendum to the documents.

Q71. Would it be possible to provide vendors with Attachments 1-13 (pages 26-52) of the RFP in Microsoft Word format for ease of responding? It is difficult to respond thoroughly within the allotted space within the PDF document.

A71. Refer to Addendum #1 and the attachment titled "MTD – RFP #2024-006 - Attachments" Excel



workbook for Attachments 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 13.

Q72. Attachment 3 – Not all tabs provide a column for comment. Can we add a comment column to those tabs?

A72. Yes, if proposers would like to add comments, please include these in a final column if a column for such is not already provided in the worksheet tab/attachment.

Q73. In Attachment 11 “Level of Effort,” 30 months of staffing is requested while in Attachment 17 “Cost,” five (5) years is requested. Please confirm whether the agencies are requesting 30 months or five (5) years.

A73. Attachment 11 intends to capture the level of effort needed to implement the system and achieve go-live, which the agencies anticipate will not exceed 30 months per agency. Attachment 17 requires pricing for five (5) years of SaaS subscription fees in addition to implementation costs, as the agencies recognize that SaaS subscription fees will continue beyond the go-live phase.

Q74. In reference to Section B.3.14 and resource loading, are vendors allowed to propose a mix of offshore and onshore resources?

A74. The agencies are open to the inclusion of offshore resources as part of the configuration process. However, the agencies prefer the main implementation team to be onshore, with support provided by offshore resources as needed.

Q75. In reference to Section B.3.14, are the agencies requiring resources be onsite during implementation?

A75. The agencies are not requiring resources to be onsite during implementation. However, if the proposed implementation plan is fully remote, the agencies would like to understand what strategies will be in place to ensure the success of the implementation.

Q76. Are proposers able to use private sector firms as client references or government only?

A76. There is no requirement regarding the type of clients to be provided as references; however, experience working with governmental and/or transit agencies is preferred.

Q77. How should cost by agency be provided? Should proposers create a line item under each tab in Attachment 17 for each agency based on the details provided in the RFP?

A77. Cost may be submitted by either creating a line item under each tab in Attachment 17 for each agency based on the details provided in the RFP or by submitting four separate cost proposals (Attachment 17).

Q78. Can a tab be added to the cost worksheet in Attachment 17 for price assumptions as there is currently no placement for price assumptions?

A78. The agencies prefer any discussion of price assumptions that go into a cost proposal be included in the narrative portion of the proposal.

Q79. Please confirm whether proposers should provide pricing solely for the initial first-year implementation or include pricing for all phases of implementation.

A79. Cost proposals shall include pricing for all phases of implementation.



GENERAL

Q80. Can the incumbent vendor be provided?

A80. Refer to Section A.3.

Q81. Can services be provided outside USA such as Canada, India, etc.?

A81. Yes, services may be provided outside the USA. The agencies primary consideration is that the services offered are qualified, accessible, and helpful to ensure that the needs of the agencies are met effectively. Quality and reliability of the support take precedence over the location of the service provider.

Q82. Please confirm if there is any minimum participation requirement from MBE/VBE?

A82. There is no minimum participation requirement on this project.

Q83. Have the agencies participated in product demonstrations in the previous 18 months? If so, which vendors provided demonstrations?

A83.

	MTD	RMTD	MetroLINK	Connect Transit
Vendors	-	Trapeze Tyler Technologies Workday	-	-

Q84. Knowing that many transit districts work with consultants to procure and implement similar systems, do the agencies intend to do the same for this project?

A84. Refer to Section A.3.