

ADDENDUM 002
Request For Proposal
Hybrid Bus
RFP 3-081022

Offerors should acknowledge receipt of Addendum 001 (ONE) by signing and including it with the original proposal. The following clarifications, questions and answers are believed to be of general interest to all potential Offerors. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged and in full force.

Name and Title of Signor (Print or type)	Name and Title of Department Authority Warren Blanchard Senior General Services Specialist
Contractor/Offeror Signature	Missouri Department of Transportation 
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	(Authorizing Signature)
Date Signed:	Date Signed:09/22/08

RFP Clarifications:

1. Contract Assignability – The resultant MoDOT contract will additionally assign purchase rights to the agencies /fleets listed on page 2:
 - a. TriMet Transportation District, Portland, Oregon,
 - b. City of White Plains, White Plains, New York,
 - c. Utah Transit Authority, Salt Lake City, Utah,
 - d. Marin County Transit, San Rafael, California,
 - e. Tahoe Transportation District, Stateline, Nevada,
 - f. City of Aspen, Aspen, Colorado,
 - g. Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts,
 - h. Sacramento Regional Transit, Sacramento, California
 - i. Missouri Department of Transportation, on behalf of,
 - i. OATS, Inc.
 - ii. Southeast Missouri Transportation Service, Inc.

2. Clarification – Sec. 6.4 Qualification Requirements – Insurance
 - a. 6.4- 1 d 1. Workers Compensation insurance
 - i. Certificate of insurance to be provided with proposal,
 - ii. Certificate of insurance to name all participating agencies as additionally insured with regards to workers compensation claims made by offeror's employees,
 - b. 6.4 – 1 d 2. Public Liability insurance

- i. Certificate of insurance to be provided with proposal naming all participating agencies as additionally insured,
- c. 6.4 – 1 d 3. Special Hazard Insurance: as required,
 - i. Certificate of insurance to be provided with proposal naming all participating agencies as additionally insured,
 - ii. 6.4 – 1 d 4. Builder's Risk Insurance (not less than the full Contract amount),
 - iii. Certificate of insurance to be provided with proposal naming all participating agencies as additionally insured,

Pre-Proposal Conference Questions and Answers

1. Question: In reading over the requirements it appears that the RFP specifically is calling out the type of partners to be associated with this opportunity. However, there are a few questions that I have....

1). Page 5 - Section 3.0 Overview – "... the Supplier Team should ideally include a bus or truck chassis and body manufacturer(s) and a hybrid driveline supplier, or be an integrated hybrid vehicle manufacturer.

This sounds like an even playing field until the next sentence is introduced which reads, "The bus/truck chassis manufacturer should be responsible for the integration of the hybrid driveline and systems into the bus/truck chassis. *A hybrid driveline supplier providing this work on it's own in the absence of a bus/truck chassis manufacturer will not be rejected; however, the proposal might not be as acceptable to MoDOT.*

If I'm reading this correctly, although the driveline supplier is part of the partnership, the RFP is really speaking to having the bus/truck chassis provide their *driveline* technology? Meaning a company that has experience with providing the chassis and a hybrid driveline, correct?

Answer: Section 3.0 describes two possible proposal team structures 1) a team of bus or truck chassis manufacturer, bus body manufacturer and hybrid driveline supplier, and 2) integrated hybrid vehicle manufacturer. The purpose of this discussion in the solicitation is to communicate that we will award from proposals offering a complete bus and will not award separate individual contracts for chassis, body and hybrid drive systems. This point is essentially re-stated in Section 4.2 entitled "Integrated Chassis/Driveline/Basic Body System Focus. Our pre-procurement research of the cutaway bus market indicated that the chassis and bodies are typically provided by separate manufacturers as are the hybrid drive systems. However, we are receptive to receiving proposals utilizing other types of manufacturing structures, such as the described "integrated hybrid vehicle manufacturer".

With respect to the sentence stating, "A hybrid driveline supplier providing this work on it's own in the absence of a bus/truck chassis manufacturer will not be rejected; however, the proposal might not be as acceptable to MoDOT.", that is speaking to having the hybrid driveline supplier provide their chassis as an "integrated hybrid vehicle manufacturer" in absence of a bus/truck chassis manufacturer as part of the team.

2. Question: Is there a desired platform or cutaway manufacturer based on performance experience?

Answer: We have spec'd for a 19,500 GVWR, 25 foot to 27 foot bus but other than that we have not requested a particular platform or cutaway manufacturer in the RFP

3. Question: This proposal was obviously written around an existing hybrid bus. Was that only because this is the basic current bus available or is there a true desire to look at other options?

Answer: No the RFP was not written around an existing hybrid bus. We are looking at all options based on the performance and bus characteristics outlined in the RFP. Section 3.2 specifically states this desire to include different technologies in this RFP.

4. Question: Is there an interest in a low floor design? Are you willing to pay more?

Answer: There is an interest but the evaluation doesn't take into consideration the extra cost. Price is 25% of the evaluation formula. Working group members are concerned about the substantial price premium already. If it is too high, then people will not participate. If adding a low floor can be done without adversely impacting the price, then a proposal can include this element.

5. Question: Is there an interest in a 10 or 12-year design vehicle? Are you willing to pay more for that?

Answer: The response to this is the same as that in Question 4.

6. Question: What is the duty cycle? 60 mph for how long? This can determine the amount of battery thus allowing for the use of a smaller engine.

Answer: The duty cycles vary and not consistent but most are used in an urban-suburban bus duty cycle with frequent stops and idling time as well as some highway speeds of 60 mph for extended periods of time. Because of this variation in duty cycles, the vehicle proposed must be a universal vehicle able to operate both in stop-and-go as well as extended highway speed situations.

7. Question: What is the maximum speed desired? Do you want a speed control option?

Answer: The RFP states a maximum speed of 70 mph. However, if a proposer wants to include a speed limiting function as a feature for the purchasing agencies to consider, that would be acceptable. This allows the agencies to make this speed limiting decision individually and work with the manufacturer as desired.

8. Question: Is CALSTART bringing any funding to the table or is the funding coming from the procuring transit agencies?

Answer: CALSTART is not bringing any funding into this procurement. The agencies will be funding purchases on their own.

9a. Question: Can you clarify Section 4.8 - what is the third party testing? Is this in-plant inspections of the buses in production?

Answer: The third party testing referred to in Section 4.8 does not refer to in-plant inspections of the buses in production. This "third party testing" refers to the comparison testing with a similar non-hybrid vehicle.

9b. Question: How can this be "third party" testing if the tester is acquired by the proposal team?

Answer: The tester can be selected by the proposal team. The tester is considered a third party in that the tester is not the chassis manufacturer, the hybrid integrator or the coach/body manufacturer.

10. Question: Does the bus have to be Altoona tested for a proposer to submit a proposal?

Answer: A bus purchased under this RFP must be Altoona tested because many of the agencies are using government – primarily FTA – dollars to purchase these buses. However, the interpretation by the group of this FTA requirement is that the bus needs to be Altoona tested by the time of delivery, not at the time the proposal is submitted. Therefore, a proposal will be accepted without Altoona testing so long as the buses are tested by the time of delivery to the agencies.