



Metropolitan Transportation Authority

MTA Procurement
333 West 34th Street, New York, NY 10001

Participating firms must acknowledge receipt of this addendum by signing below and returning this form with the proposal.

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFI No. 0009000032

Qualified Product List (QPL) Process – Secure, Accessible & Modern Fare Gates

Procurement Contact:	Phone #: 347-802-7121	Date: January 31, 2024
Reggie Matela	Email: reggie.matela@mtahq.org	

***PROPOSAL NEW DUE DATE: FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 2024**

Proposal deadline has been changed from February 29, 2024 to March 8, 2024

The following attachments are included as part of this Addendum No. 1:

- Attachment 1 provides the presentation deck from the pre-proposal conference held on January 17th, 2024.
- Attachment 2 provides the list of attendees at the virtually held pre-proposal conference.
- Attachment 3 provides answers to questions submitted by potential proposers.

Except as expressly modified herein, all else remains as originally issued and in full force.

Name of Proposer:	
<hr/>	
Proposer's Authorized Signature:	
<hr/>	
Title:	Date:
<hr/>	<hr/>

Attachment No. 1 - RFI Presentation

**Request for Information (RFI) No.
0009000032**

**Qualified Product List (QPL) Process Secure,
Accessible & Modern Fare Gates**

Wednesday, January 17, 2024

2:00 PM EST

TEAMS Meeting



Agenda

- 1. MTA Introductions**
- 2. Standard Guidelines**
- 3. RFI Key Points and Dates**
- 4. RFI Proposal Requirements**
- 5. RFI Purpose & Phases**
- 6. QPL Process & Future Solicitation**
- 7. Scope of Work/ Technical Requirements**
- 8. FAQs**
- 9. Other Questions**

Guidelines

- ❑ RFI process will prequalify products for future purchase
- ❑ Restricted Period
 - MTA Procurement is Single Point of Contact
 - All communications to other than Procurement is prohibited
- ❑ Pre-Proposal Conference is non-binding
 - This Conference allows for feedback on RFI requirements and address questions
 - All questions submitted in writing and all official change to the requirements will be addressed in writing via an Addendum to the RFI.
 - This presentation and the list of attendees to today's conference will be shared with all requesters and potential participants of the RFI via an Addendum to the RFI
 - More questions will be accepted by 3PM EST, Friday January 19th
 - RFI Addendum target release date has been changed from January 24th to January 31st, 2024

Key Dates and Points (subject to change)

Milestone	Target Dates
RFI release date	December 26, 2023
Pre-proposal Conference	January 17, 2024
Written Questions to Procurement	3PM EST, January 19, 2024
Addendum 1 – Responses to Vendor Questions, Clarifications, Corrections, Copy of Presentation, List of Attendees	January 31, 2024
RFI Proposals Due	February 29, 2024
Phase 2 Qualification	Q2 2024
Phase 2 Testing	Q2/Q3 2024
Phase 3 Qualification & Testing	Q3/Q4 2024
Establish QPL (purchase of gates can begin)	2025

RFI Proposal Requirements

- All RFI proposals MUST be emailed to reggie.matela@mtahq.org by February 29, 2024, including all necessary detailed descriptions of equipment being proposed, specs, statement of work, pricing, etc.
- RFI Submission must clearly include firm's legal name and address, the firm's primary point of contact name, email and telephone number.
- Cost (ROM) on a separate excel file

Pertinent RFI sections:

- Bottom of page 2- 3 for required submission
- Bottom of page 11 for what's being evaluated

QPL Process & Future Solicitations

- Qualified Gates cannot be modified without advanced notice and written approval by the MTA
- RFI Attachment 2 Certification Required
- QPL Committee approval/ Inventory ID Assigned
- At the time of need, standard IFB solicitation process will be followed - award to the lowest bidder for the prequalified product.
- During IFB, if a firm submits a bid other than the QPL brand as an equivalent product, the firm will be notified that they are nonresponsive and to seek, in a separate effort, possible qualification approval process for that equivalent product.
- QPL – can be used by all MTA Agencies

RFI Purpose

Identify and qualify modern gates that meet the MTA's objectives around:

- Improving **accessibility**, particularly with regards to improving the customer experience for riders with disabilities above the current AFAS gates.
- Incentivizing **fare compliance** and **reducing fare evasion** by making it easier to pay the fare and deterring evasion for standard and accessible gates.
- Enhancing the **passenger experience** for all riders.

RFI Phases

Phase 1: Review of vendor submissions (*current phase*)

Phase 2*: Lab-based testing

- 2A: Lab-based testing (without OMNY integration)
- 2B: Lab-based testing (with OMNY integration)

Phase 3:** In System testing (with OMNY integration)

Gates that pass all three phases of the RFI will be put on MTA's QPL for future procurements.

**MTA reserves the right to combine Phases 2A and 2B of the RFI*

***Stations for in system testing have not yet been selected*

Current Fare Gates

**Low Turnstile
(LT)**



**Emergency Exit
Gate (EXG)**



**ADA Fare Access
System (AFAS)**



**High Entry/Exit
Turnstile (HEET)**



Current Fare Gates



Scope of Work / Technical Requirements

Gates must demonstrate ability to:

- Provide optimal passenger flow and convenience
- Minimize fare evasion
- Capable of being deployed at scale across the NYCT subway system
- Integrate with OMNY fare payment system and any future fare payment media
- Withstand MTA's harsh operating environment
- Limit maintenance needs and complications
- An accessible version of the gate must meet ADA compliance and accessibility objectives

Frequently Asked Questions

- Current number and types of MTA faregates installed in Subway stations
- Materials & specifications for new faregates
- Accessibility requirements
- Installation of new faregates
- New hardware & software integration
- Multiple submissions of proposed gates
- Federal vs State terms and conditions (Buy America)

Attachment 2 - Attendees to the Pre-RFI Conference -January 17, 2024

- 1 Adam Buchanan - adam@capalino.com
- 2 Adrian Burton <adrian.burton@aeroturn.com>
- 3 Agostini Giuseppe <G.Agostini@almaviva.it>
- 4 Alex Litchfield <alex.litchfield@vixtechnology.com>
- 5 ANAND Sam <sam.anand@urbanandmainlines.com>
- 6 Beggs, Ronnie (GB) - Ronnie.Beggs@cubic.com
- 7 Bozzelli, Anthony <anthony.bozzelli@accenture.com>
- 8 Brunet, Bill - Bill.Brunet@conduent.com
- 9 Bryan Cunningham from Moovel
- 10 Chris Boylan <cboylan@capalino.com>
- 11 cboylan@gcany.net
- 12 Combette, Alain - acombette@go-easier.com
- 13 David Kang - 강태욱 <davidtkang@straffic.com>
- 14 Davis, O'Shea (US) <O'Shea.Davis@cubic.com>
- 15 Di Serio Stefania <S.DiSerio@almaviva.it>
- 16 Dušek Petr <p.dusek@mikroelektronika.cz>
- 17 Fred Yang from Straffic - <chanmo.yang@straffic.com>
- 18 Fuad ALSAGOFF <Fuad.Alsagoff@stengg.com>
- 19 Gabriele Zeni <g.zeni@saimasicurezza.com>
- 20 gfpippa@saimanorthamerica.com
- 21 Guido Pippa <gfpippa@goaccudraft.com>
- 22 Heinen.Henning <Heinen.Henning@scheidt-bachmann.de>
- 23 Henry, Christian - Christian.Henry@cubic.com
- 24 Ian Newberg <ian.newberg@moovel.com>
- 25 Jordan Brock - Jordan Brock <jbrock@mapstrat.com>
- 26 Joseph De Carlo <jdecarlo@solaricorp.com>
- 27 Jun Oh - junoh@straffic.co.kr
- 28 Korycki, Mike (US) <Mike.Korycki@cubic.com>
- 29 Koubek Martin <m.koubek@mikroelektronika.cz>
- 30 Lee Wey Leon Nicholas - nicholas.lee@stengg.com
- 31 LLOPIS Raul <RLLOPIS@go-easier.com>
- 32 Louh, Anthony - Anthony.Louh@cubic.com
- 33 Marc Bolduc <m.bolduc@saimaamerica.com>
- 34 Mark Geering <Mark.Geering@Gunnebo.com>
- 35 Michel Alexandre - alexandre.michel@urbanandmainlines.com
- 36 Molly Millar <mollym@hyperlightsystems.ca>
- 37 Mueller.Thomas <Mueller.Thomas@Scheidt-Bachmann.de>
- 38 Nicholas Pilgrim - nicholas.pilgrim@acumentransit.com
- 39 Ong Ee Kiat Lovell <lovell.ongek@stengg.com>
- 40 PANG Allan <allan.pangbl@stengg.com>
- 41 paul korczak <korczakpaul@gmail.com> from STraffic
- 42 Ravel Jean Guy - jean-guy.ravel@urbanandmainlines.com
- 43 Rems, Mitchell <mitchell.rems@accenture.com>
- 44 SULENTIC Tony <tony.sulentic@urbanandmainlines.com>
- 45 Swennen Augustin <aswennen@go-easier.com>
- 46 Tim Burke <tim.burke@vixtechnology.com>
- 47 Toby Holmes - Holmes.Toby@scheidt-bachmann-usa.com
- 48 Vadim Kyrs - VadimK@hyperlightsystems.ca
- 49 vonSydow.Thorsten <vonSydow.Thorsten@scheidt-bachmann.de>
- 50 Walsh, Scott <swalsh@initusa.com>
- 51 Wilensky, David - David.Wilensky@cubic.com
- 52 Wilson Santos <Wilson.santos@faactechologies.com>
- 53 Wong, Richard - Richard.Wong@parsons.com
- 54 wsantos@magnetic-usa.com

Attachment No. 3 – Answers to Proposer Questions
Addendum No. 1 – RFI No. 0009000032

I. Technical Requirements

1. Modern AWAG design often includes additional readers mounted on side panels to accommodate customers with reach and movement special needs. Does the MTA envision adopting this feature?

MTA Response: MTA prefers a single entry reader. However, proposers can offer alternate design options for review of merit.

2. Does the MTA intend for the entire WAG/AWAG gate to be fabricated from 304 Stainless Steel in #4 finish, not just the OCS?

MTA Response: The entire gate does not need to be fabricated from 304 Stainless Steel. However, the MTA requires gate materials to meet comparable durability and to minimize use of non-durable materials as much as possible. The use of PVC is prohibited.

3. For the sake of clarity, will the MTA allow the body of a proposed WAG/AWAG design to extend beyond 50" at points above floor level in the manner, for example, that current mounting of OMNY readers occurs?

MTA Response: The MTA may consider extensions beyond the 50' above floor level as long as they do not diminish throughput capacity and aisle clearance.

4. There is no mention in the RFI of paddle dimensions. Does this mean that MTA is considering all options and would be open to testing different paddle sizes and materials in Phases 2-4?

MTA Response: Yes, the MTA is open to testing multiple paddle sizes.

5. In reference to both the Wide-Aisle Gates (WAGs) and the Accessible Wide-Aisle Gates (AWAGs), what size glass panels/doors does MTA prefer? For example, our glass doors can range from 39" (waist height) to 78" (full height).

MTA Response: The MTA is open to testing multiple paddle sizes, with a preference for a height and width of paddles that deters fare evasion.

6. Please specify whether physical button shall be equipped with in the WAG or can just provide simulation for the mimics the loss of power.

MTA Response: The MTA expects gates to be equipped with a button that can be enabled/disabled in programming.

7. Please specify what the minimum dimension requirements are.

MTA Response: The current low turnstile aisle width is 16.7" at the base (and 22" above the barriers). However, the MTA is open to any dimensions that meet the exit throughput of at least 55PPM.

8. For the sake of clarity, does the MTA wish to have the exit capacity for the WAGs/AWAGs remain at 50 as stated in V/B.2.viii?

MTA Response: The MTA wishes for exit capacity to be equal or greater to existing capacity of low turnstiles.

9. Is MTA interested in a “Desk Control” unit that allows the user to freely operate the machines from a nearby location in case of an emergency?

MTA Response: The MTA would welcome reviewing various design features, including a unit that allows the agency to have remote control of the gate paddles (lock/unlock) from a nearby location.

10. Is MTA interested in adding their decal on the panel doors?

MTA Response: The MTA would welcome reviewing finishes on panel doors.

11. Per Section 7. Customer Communications/Assistance Functions, item i., it states “The AWAG shall have an integrated two-way communications device capable of connecting to an on-site or remote voice receiver.” Would it be possible to specify the dB levels / sensitivity required for the speaker and microphone? Is this function required on both entry and exit? In addition, is it expected that there will be multiple speakers for help and assistance and for fare validation feedback?

MTA Response: All dB levels and sensitivity requirements must adhere to current MTA standards.

12. For the sake of clarity, can we know the maximum width of one AWAG's cabinet as well as one WAG's cabinet?

MTA Response: There is no maximum width requirement for the AWAG/WAG cabinet. The MTA is open to any dimensions that meet the exit throughput of at least 55PPM and, for the AWAG, ADA compliance.

13. Are there any limitations on the width of the floor plinth that the gates are mounted on and if so, what are maximum widths for the gates?

MTA Response: The widths of the floor plinths are station specific based on array configuration and will need to be assessed on a station-by-station basis. Also, see response to No. 12 above.

14. General Design Parameters, RFI section B.2.

- a. RFI section B.2.ii: There is always the conflict between short gate length for easy station installation/integration and long gate length for optimized passenger flow and fraud detection/prevention. Experience has shown that it's always up to the specific requirements of the customer to find the perfect fit. Therefore, we have a gate platform which offers flexible options for scaling of the gate length. As standard products, a gate body with a length of 51 inches (1300 mm) and a gate body with a length of 71 inches (1800 mm) are out-of-the-shelf in our portfolio. Considering your focus on fraud prevention / detection we would like to understand the background of your requirement on maximum gate length on floor level. We are happy to adapt our existing product portfolio to your needs once we found the optimal fit to your needs together. **Could you explain the background of the requirement for a gate length of 50 inches at floor level?** What are the requirements regarding the overall length of the gate?

MTA Response: Existing low turnstiles are 50" long. From a passenger flow perspective. Based on frequent limitations of available fare control area space, it would be ideal to stay at or go even less than 50" in length. MTA is not firmly opposed to a longer 71"-long WAG/AWAG, but it should be understood that there potentially will be some locations where the longer gate is problematic and/or would require a more comprehensive rearrangement of existing turnstiles. Also see answers to related Question Nos. 21 to 23.

- b. RFI section B.2.iii: The requirement was understood to mean that the maximum clear width of a WAG passage must not exceed 24 inches. Taking into account the width of one complete gate body plus protrusion of both panels / paddles (left and right) plus the clear width of the passage, the maximum width must not exceed 36 inches. Is this interpretation of the requirements correct?

MTA Response: The dimensions listed in the requirement were of the current pilot hardware. The MTA is open to alternate dimensions of cabinets as long as they meet the minimum throughput requirements in the Technical Specifications. While there is no maximum width requirement, the narrower the width, the easier and more flexibility there is to install. Also see answers to related Question Nos. 7 and 12.

- c. RFI section B.2.vii: S&B assumes that the holes/bolts of the old gates are removed and sealed so that the new gates are positioned fitting the new body width and required clearance. Is this assumption correct?

MTA Response: The MTA will ensure site readiness for installation and commissioning of new gates.

- d. RFI section B.2.xii: Depending on which side a passenger arrives and is validated on, the panels open away from the passenger towards the other side by default. We understand the case of simultaneous arrival of passengers on the paid and unpaid side as follows: When passengers arrive at the same time (validation on the ENTRY/UNPAID side and entering the sensor system in case of free exit on the EXIT/PAID side), the panels are opened in the direction towards the UNPAID side. The exiting passenger on the PAID side crosses the passage to the UNPAID side. The open state of the gate remains. The waiting passenger on the UNPAID side walks from the UNPAID side to the PAID side with the panels "against" the passenger. The panels close after the person has passed the safety sensors. Is our understanding of this requirement, correct?

MTA Response: This understanding is correct based on the current paddle behavior of the MTA's pilot AWAG/WAG. Behavior is based upon validation of the tap and activation of the aisle sensors. Third party gate design must align with current fare payment configurations at the time. These configurations are adjustable according to MTA's stated needs.

15. Uniform Code Compliance, RFI section B.4.

- a. RFI section B.4.i: The requirement reads "*Bottom of AWAG barriers must be no more than 27" (686 mm) above the walking surface*". This requirement is not clear to us. Could you explain in more detail how this requirement is to be understood? (Might be typo?)

MTA Response: The MTA expects gates to comply with NFPA 130, 2010 ADAAG, and the Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code (generally based on the 2018 IBC and the station specific 19 NYCRR Part 1228 "Uniform Code Provisions for Rail Stations."

- b. RFI section B.4.v: Our Faregate products are NRTL certified. In addition to UL325 and the standards listed therein, our products are compliant with NFPA 130, "2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design" as well as FCC part 15. Are there any other norms, laws and standards that need to be considered, particularly with regard to safety? If so, can you please name them?

MTA Response: The MTA expects gates to comply with NFPA 130, 2010 ADAAG, and the Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code (generally based on the 2018 IBC and the station specific 19 NYCRR Part 1228 "Uniform Code Provisions for Rail Stations").

II. Installation & Maintenance

16. On page 9/30 section xii. Mean-Time-To-Repair (MTTR) for Gate components must be no greater than 0.5 hours with 90 percent of the repairs completed within 0.9 hours. What are the events that will measure the start and end the measurement for MTTR?

MTA Response: MTTR will be measured from the time the maintainer logs into the gate controller board to address an incident to the time the repair is complete.

17. For the sake of clarity, it is current that the MTA expects Participants to perform all installation and commissioning work in MTA stations designated for the In-Service Test?

MTA Response: The MTA expects that proposers perform installation work as part of the in-system testing.

18. What, if any, field support will MTA provide for installation and commissioning? Specifically, will MTA perform removal of legacy turnstiles and other equipment, or any preparatory steps to assure site readiness for installation of new WAGs and AWAGs?

MTA Response: The MTA will remove legacy turnstiles and other equipment and will provide means for power and communications to assure site readiness for installation and commissioning of new gates. The proposer is responsible for installation and commissioning (ERN), however, the MTA will provide onsite access as needed.

19. Legacy AFAS: For installation work, does the MTA require that proposers remove legacy AFAS, "slam", emergency exits, and standard turnstiles?

MTA Response: No. The MTA will remove legacy turnstiles and other equipment and will provide means for power and communications to assure site readiness for installation of new gates.

20. For deployment of test fare gates at MTA stations, does the MTA expect proposers to use their own contractors, or will MTA personnel perform work and then seek reimbursement from proposers? If proposer may use their own contractors, what safety and other special training will be required of their contractors?

MTA Response: The MTA expects that proposers utilize their own contractors to perform installation and commissioning work. Key personnel for the contractors must meet OSHA training requirements and have demonstrated experience in construction management. The MTA will provide more details on contractor requirements ahead of Phase 3 of testing.

21. Will the MTA absorb the costs of non-fare gate related physical changes to the fare control areas? (i.e. moving existing wrought iron partitions, TVMs, or other station infrastructure elements, etc.)

MTA Response: Yes, for any modifications/removal approved in advance by the MTA.

22. Iron works: It would appear that deployment of new fare gates may require modifications/removal of "iron" work. Does MTA expect the proposers to perform removals and modifications?

MTA Response: No.

23. Does the MTA anticipate reconfiguring fare control areas to provide for increased space needs for multiple Wide Aisle Gates, or is the expectation only one accessible gate in each array?

MTA Response: The MTA has not made any determination on the reconfiguration of fare control areas at this point. Reconfiguration in the future will need to be considered on a station and array-specific basis.

24. Restore: At the conclusion of the pilots, who will restore fare control areas to their original configurations?

MTA Response: Proposers will be responsible for removing their proprietary equipment and the MTA will restore the fare control areas to their desired configuration.

25. Could the MTA please provide the detailed specification of all wires, outlets, or cables that can be used/connected for new faregate in a station. e.g.) x number of Ethernet lines, x number of serial communications with x baud, and etc.

MTA Response: Each Fare Control Area (FCA) has 3 dedicated 30A breakers for low turnstiles and typically a 1 ½" conduit that carries up to 11 wires (5 of which are for turnstiles, 3 phases, 1 neutral and 1 ground). The wire size (AWG) < 200' # 10; 200'-400' # 8; ground is #6 Category 6 cable used from Access Node to main cabinet at FCA then one Cat 6 cable to each low turnstile. The MTA can provide more details on specifications in Phase 2 and 3 of testing.

III. Existing NYCT Fare Equipment

26. Can the MTA please provide exact counts of the different types of fare control equipment in systemwide use?

MTA Response: Currently there are over 3,800 low turnstiles, 475 HEETs, 500 AFAS Gates, and 1,500 Emergency Exit Gates within the NYCT Subway System across over 470 stations.

27. Can we get a listing of the number of faregates currently installed at each station, and the type (WAG, AWAG, AFAS and HEET type gates)? How many of each type are at each station, for each type of faregate.

MTA Response: Currently there are over 3,800 low turnstiles, 475 HEETs, 500 AFAS Gates, and 1,500 Emergency Exit Gates within the NYCT Subway System across over 470 stations. A typical fare control area contains a fare array including a minimum of 2 to as many as 20 low turnstiles, none or 1 AFAS or at least 1 Emergency Exit Gate.

28. Can NYC Metro provide dimensional information on the current WAG and AWAG gates, specifically: The dimensions of each faregate module (length, width of cabinet), and the dimensions of the gate aisle

widths.

MTA Response: The current WAG stanchion deployed as part of a pilot is 6 inches wide, 60 inches long, and 42 inches in height.

29. Can you provide all the dimensions of the low turnstiles “LTs”?

MTA Response: The low turnstile is 11.3” at base reducing to 6 inches at the top half, with a 16.7” aisle clearance. The MTA does not recommend using low turnstile dimensions as a model for new gates as the intent is to provide more modern gates that meet the MTA’s objectives of improving the customer experience, accessibility, and fare compliance.

30. Can the MTA please provide the entry/exit speeds of the AFAS Gate?

MTA Response: The current AFAS Gate opens in approximately 5 seconds, remains open for 6-7 seconds in compliance with ADA requirements, and closes in approximately 5 seconds. The MTA is hoping to consider gates that may open and close faster, while still ensuring customer safety and code compliance.

31. Can you provide the time to enter/exit per customer on AFAS gate and turnstile?

MTA Response: The current AFAS Gate opens in approximately 5 seconds, remains open for 6-7 seconds in accordance with ADA requirements, and closes in approximately 5 seconds. The MTA is hoping to consider gates that may open and close faster, while still ensuring rider safety and code compliance.

The current low turnstiles are activated by customer force upon paid entry and the tripod arm revolves in (X) seconds, where X is the speed of the person walking through the turnstile barrier.

32. Per Section 2. General Design Parameters, item ix., it states “AWAG shall have an equal or shorter time to enter/exit per customer, compared to both current AFAS Gate and turnstile.” What is the Passenger throughput criteria for the existing AFAS?

MTA Response: The current throughput of the existing AFAS is 25 PPM.

33. Out of all current gates within the subway stations, are you able to confirm the average number of cycles that one gate has completed within a certain time frame? Ex., day, month, etc. Any available data on cycles is appreciated.

MTA Response: The average turnstile sees 22M to 25M entries per week but could widely vary dependent on station.

34. Will the results of the current pilot be published prior to the RFI submission deadline? If not, will they be published before the RFP is issued?

MTA Response: The MTA does not intend to publish results from the current WAG pilot.

IV. Payment System & OMNY Integration

35. Does the MTA intend for proposed new WAGs/AWAGs to retain the same physical location and dimensional features of the OMNY readers on the legacy turnstiles?

MTA Response: The MTA expects proposers to propose design aspects that generally retain the physical locations and dimensional features of the existing OMNY validators. The MTA prefers designs where the validator is incorporated within the appliance (gate hardware) by design and to appear visually seamless with the gate and not as an “add on” through additional hardware.

36. Will the MTA provide APIs and access to documentation to support third-party integration with the OMNY system?

MTA Response: Yes, these will be provided when applicable.

37. At the time of selection to move forward into Phases 2-4 of the QPL process, will successful applicants have the opportunity to review APIs and documentation of the OMNY system and evaluate any impact on completion of Phases 2-4?

MTA Response: These will be provided when applicable.

38. For the purposes of integration with the OMNY system and MTA NY's legacy maintenance and data systems, does the MTA have APIs for this purpose?

MTA Response: These will be provided when applicable.

39. Can the MTA confirm/guarantee that RFI respondents will be provided with all necessary access to API's to the OMNY system in order to level the playing field?

MTA Response: These will be provided when applicable.

40. Please confirm that MTA intends to use the existing OMNY readers in the new WAGs/AWAGs. If yes, can the MTA please share details of mounting requirements and restrictions for the OMNY reader?

MTA Response: Yes, the MTA intends to use existing OMNY validators in future gates. The mounting requirements will depend on the gate design itself in terms of how such mounting can meet the technical requirements.

41. Has MTA validated the completeness and accuracy, and tested the operational functionality of technology documentation and APIs provided as part of the OMNY contract?

MTA Response: Documentation will be made available to facilitate the development of the interface necessary between the gate and the validator. As part of development and integration, the interface is verified through testing.

42. Will proposers have the opportunity to evaluate OMNY and other system documentation and determine what they need to complete the integration process and review that with the MTA prior at the start of Phase II of the RFI?

MTA Response: No, not prior to Phase 2. For Phase 2, proposers selected to participate in Phase 2 will have opportunity to review relevant documentation.

43. Can you provide OMNY validator mechanical dimensions, 3D drawing views of this component and type of interface to connect it with the CPU of AWAG/WAG gates?

MTA Response: These will be provided as appropriate. Please note that the MTA will provide the Validator; and the Proposer and Cubic, the MTA's system integrator, need to make an agreement for integration services.

44. Can the MTA provide physical dimension of OMNY module which will be integrated with AWAG/WAG?

MTA Response: Please refer to the responses to #43 above and #55 below.

45. Because OMNY accepts credit/debit, PCI compliance is mandatory. The presence or absence of PCI-compliant E2E encryption originating at the reader impacts the technical design of equipment in the data stream. Can MTA please describe the general method of PCI compliance for OMNY?

MTA Response: E2E encryption is utilized, originating at the reader where the PAN is hashed when the card is presented.

46. What is the Subway Validator? Is it a second validator in addition to OMNY one? If yes, can you provide Subway Validator mechanical dimensions, 3D drawing views of this component and type of interface to connect it with the CPU of AWAG/WAG gates? Are they 2 different backends, NFPS and OMNY, currently in operation? If yes, AWAG/WAG gates must interfaced / connected to both backends?

MTA Response: The "Subway Validator" is the OMNY validator, sometimes also referred to as the OMNY reader. It is specific to the subway and similar environments. Please refer to the response to #44 above. There is only one backend, the OMNY backend. "NFPS" is the project name that derives from the contract between the MTA and Cubic. "OMNY" is the MTA's branded name for the system. They are one in the same thing, NFPS and OMNY.

47. System Integration (with OMNY), RFI section B.1.

- a. What physical dimensions does the OMNY validation unit have? Are drawings and/or STEP files available?

MTA Response: Please refer to the responses to #43 above and #55 below.

- b. Can technical details about the electrical power requirements (voltage, typical and maximum current or PoE ...) be provided?

MTA Response: Please refer to the responses to #43 above and #55 below.

- c. Can details about the physical data interface (100 MBit Ethernet, ...) and the logical/software data interface be provided?

MTA Response: Please refer to the responses to #43 above and #55 below.

- d. Can system diagrams and/or communication structure diagrams of the OMNY validator data structure

be provided which cover all use cases (local gate operation and to backoffice(s)?)

MTA Response: Please refer to the responses to #43 above and #55 below.

- e. Is there any PCI-DSS related or key handling procedure to be managed by the gate supplier when integrating the OMNY validator because of handling bank cards? If yes, what level of support regarding retrieving the required information e.g. from Cubic is provided by the MTA?

MTA Response: No such procedure to be handled by the gate supplier.

- f. How will the MTA ensure that all QPL participants have equal access to OMNY validator and system APIs and documentation required? How will you ensure that no intellectual property / patent protection by Cubic will prohibit the participants from integrating the OMNY reader?

MTA Response: All RFI participants who reach Phase 2 will have equal access to the information and services needed to participate as required in Phase 2, and similarly for Phase 3.

- g. RFI B.1.v. requests that “[The Gate] allows for local operation and service maintenance of the gate.” Which use cases does the MTA have in mind?

MTA Response: The gate proposer should detail to the MTA how the gate would interact for maintenance purposes, whether it would be done locally (maintainer present) and/or through service events that trigger work orders such as use of ServiceNow.

- h. Validation feedback is provided by the screen of the OMNY validator. However, the RFI B.1.vi. requests “[The Gate] integrates the Subway Validator so that it also serves as an audible and visual warning system to the customer that Gate doors will open after fare collection.” What is expected in detail? Should the OMNY validator provide the audible and visual warning only? Or is it also reasonable to use the gate functionality in addition, e.g. the loudspeaker of the gate?

MTA Response: The gate provides the audible and visual warnings which is initiated by the validator.

48. Can you confirm that the communication between AWAG/WAG gates and the backend(s) is managed/monitored by OMNY validator?

MTA Response: Today, the validator (on all gates) communicates with the OMNY backend, and not the gate directly.

49. Who’s responsible for system integration of AWAG/WAG gates with OMNY and NFPS backends?

MTA Response: The proposer pursuant to an agreement to be reached by the proposer with Cubic.

50. Apart from system integration with OMNY, is MTA also expecting the participant to be able to interface/integrate with legacy backend payment systems

MTA Response: Yes, with the Spear system used to maintain the Subway gates and validators.

51. Are there any SDKs that will allow interfacing with the current OMNY Backend?

MTA Response: Please refer to Response to #48 above.

52. How many OMNY validators are to be installed on the gates? Will there be a need to include other validators, QR Code scanners or Biometric identification readers?

MTA Response: At this time, only a validator on the entry side is required. Gates should be designed though such that the MTA has flexibility to move to a tap in/tap out system in the future with readily available space for placement of a validator on the exit side.

53. Can the MTA confirm that RFI respondents will be provided with all necessary rules for connecting to the OMNY systems and necessary security protocols?

MTA Response: Yes.

54. Does the relationship between MTA and Cubic allow third-party access to OMNY technology and documentation necessary to complete the integration process? If yes, under what conditions will this be allowed?

MTA Response: For the purposes of the RFI, Cubic will provide the necessary documentation to allow a third party gate proposer to integrate the validator with the gate, and with the MTA's permission, the validator with the OMNY platform.

For the purpose of gate procurement, this is to be determined. The MTA intends for gates to be delivered with the validators, and to have the gates tested with the validators (factory testing for starters) before they are delivered.

55. During the OMNY technology integration effort, will the fare gate provider have the opportunity to interact directly with Cubic personnel on technical matters?

MTA Response: Yes, pursuant to the agreement to be reached between the proposer and Cubic.

56. Will MTA/Cubic provide simulators to facilitate testing integration with the OMNY system and other legacy systems?

MTA Response: No.

57. In the later Phases of the RFI, will the qualified proposers have access to development regions to enable necessary testing of the integration with OMNY?

MTA Response: Yes, a proposer's gate will have to get connected as an asset to Cubic's test regions.

58. Will MTA consider taking on the responsibility for the integration agreement with Cubic versus requiring this of the proposer in order to address any unfair advantage Cubic would have as the OMNY SI?

MTA Response: No.

59. Does MTA's licenses for Spear and ServicePro permit integration with third party technology? What versions of these software packages is MTA using?

MTA Response: Spear interfaces with Cubic's instance of Service Now (SN). Any proposer would have to interface with SN, Cubic would then handle pushing it to Spear.

60. Do you provide the details for interface between your legacy systems like Spear and ServiceNow? What kind of features expected in those interfaces?

MTA Response: MTA will provide as needed when applicable.

61. Is Cubic going to provide a "one price" model for all interested proposers to ensure fair pricing?

MTA Response: This is a determination that Cubic has to make given that every gate is different.

62. Proposers have been orally advised by NYCT that each proposer is individually responsible for gaining access to the technical details needed for the integration of the OMNY fare readers into the proposer's faregate in order to respond to the RFI. Proposers were directed by NYCT to each individually contact Cubic, the incumbent back-office provider and likely proposer in response to the RFI, in order to arrange for such access. Each individual proposer must negotiate the scope of such access, the terms under which such access is provided, and the financial impact. This creates a situation where proposers will not be equally or similarly situated vis a vis each non-incumbent proposer and all non-incumbent proposers shall be disadvantage vis-à-vis the incumbent proposer. Please advise what steps NYCT has taken and is taking to ensure that all proposers will attain access to the necessary integration technical information and that all proposers shall attain access upon the same terms contractually and economically as the other proposers. Additionally, please describe the steps NYCT has taken and is taking to ensure that such access will be sufficient to enable non-incumbent proposers to submit fully responsive proposals.

MTA Response: The MTA is cognizant that Cubic, the system integrator for OMNY, will be a likely proposer on the RFI. For those proposers that are qualified to move on to Phase 2 - the MTA will officially notify proposers to contact Cubic to make arrangements for integration services to support the proposer. Based on such agreement between the proposer and Cubic, Cubic will provide the necessary technical information for system integration with OMNY, and to the extent any such information is proprietary to Cubic, the proposer will need to execute a non-disclosure agreement with Cubic.

63. MTA stated that each participant in the RFI will need to negotiate separately and directly with Cubic to gain access to information necessary to allow integration with the OMNY system. The reason cited was that integration with a particular proposer's solution would require different information from Cubic. Could the MTA really mean that the information needed from Cubic for software development and provided potentially differ for each proposer? If yes, how does the MTA plan to evaluate testing of software functionality, performance, and compliance with functional requirements?

MTA Response: Please refer to the response to #62 above. The proposer is responsible for any adjustments to its firmware needed to integrate with the validator software.

64. In MTA's proposed timeline for the RFI, how much time has been allotted for proposers to negotiate agreements with Cubic?

MTA Response: For those proposers that successfully move on to Phase 2, MTA is open to reviewing timelines required by the proposers in order to be successful.

65. For the testing phases, will the MTA as owner of the OMNY system provide necessary test fare media?

MTA Response: The MTA will provide test media.

66. For testing purposes, will participants in Phase 2-3 have access to test regions either at MTA or at Cubic?

MTA Response: Please refer to the Response to #57 above.

67. Could the MTA please provide the overall system configuration from station level devices including faregate to NFPS backend including other legacy systems. Also please provide the detail of how those components are connected.

MTA Response: Please refer to the Response to #48 above.

V. Accessibility

68. Over and above ADA compliance and AWAG gates, are there any additional Accessibility requirements?

MTA Response: ADA compliance for AWAGs is the required accessibility standard of compliance, but the MTA welcomes any additional accessibility features and innovations that will enhance accessibility for our customers while advancing the performance of the gates.

69. How will MTA evaluate the universal accessibility readiness of the new system?

MTA Response: MTA will evaluate accessible gates for ADA compliance. As well, all features within the AWAGs, and where suitable within the WAGs, will be reviewed for any additional accessibility feature that will help the needs of customers.

70. Is the accessibility manager or an accessibility expert consultant part of the MTA's evaluation committee? (For example, in Vancouver, Canada some accessibility requirements were overlooked, and remediation had to be implemented to make the fare gates universally accessible, while at MARTA in Atlanta and MBTA in Boston, our industry leading accessibility design features were incorporated into the fare collection system design requirements).

MTA Response: Yes, the Selection Committee has a member from the MTA Accessibility team as does the Technical Advisory Committee.

71. Will MTA limit accessibility requirements to ADA guidelines (they are 35 years old) or adopt more current universal design principles like the ones being advocated by accessibility rights experts like Dr. Victor Pineda and Victor Calise?

MTA Response: All accessibility features will be evaluated on merit. AWAGs must meet all ADA requirements at minimum, and all features within the AWAGs, and where suitable within the AWAGs, will be reviewed for any additional accessibility feature that will help the needs of customers.

72. Will an accessibility solution for frictionless mobility have its own grading criteria or will it be graded as a part of an overall system solution?

MTA Response: See response to Q71.

73. One key advantage of our Hands-Free Fare Gate solution for People with Physical Disabilities (PWDs) is that it can be integrated with any fare-gate proposer to make the fare-gates universal design compliant and a great customer experience. We don't manufacture faregates ourselves but, because of our integration capabilities, we can be compatible with almost any fare-gate manufacturer. For the purposes of the RFI, would MTA be interested in learning about our solution as a stand-alone system that complements any short-listed fare-gate proponents?

MTA Response: The purpose of the RFI is to learn about technology and infrastructure solutions that will provide the MTA and its customers fare gates that are accessible and meet the needs of our customers. The MTA is interested in full-scale infrastructure solutions. It is recommended for proposers that have these capabilities to start partnerships with manufacturers in order for these solutions to be included in the RFI response.

74. Similarly, when it comes to the Lab Test phase, we can demonstrate how we can integrate the Hands-Free Faregate enhancement for PWDs with any of the successful proponents. Would that be a novel and desirable approach to MTA?

MTA Response: See response to Question No. 73.

VI. Gate Deployment & Timing

75. Does the MTA plan on a one-for-one replacement of regular turnstiles with WAGs?

MTA Response: The MTA is looking for fare gate solutions that maintain (or improve) passenger throughput at each fare array. This could, but does not necessarily need to, mean a one-for-one replacement of low turnstiles dependent on the throughput of proposed gates compared to current turnstiles and fare array configuration.

76. Does the MTA plan for a one-for-one replacement of AFAS and of EXG with WAGs and/or AWAGs? if there is more than one type of Emergency Exit Gate (EXG) and 2) whether the EXG is the same as, or more commonly called the "slam gate."

MTA Response: In the MTA's current pilot, each gate has been replaced with a single AWAG. However, the MTA may be open to alternate configurations that maintain passenger throughput and provide accessible entrance and egress.

There are three different control line gates with panic bar hardware: 1) Agent Operated Gate (AOG), 2) Emergency Exit EE, 3) ADA Farecard Access System/Agent Operated Gates (AFAS/AOG).

EXGs have been referred to as 'slam gates' or 'exit gates.'

77. Do proposers have to provide all of the gate types (LT, EXG, AFAS, HEET) in the RFI?

MTA Response: The MTA is not intending to replicate existing gate types. The MTA is seeking secure, modern, and accessible fare gates that represent the next generation of fare gate technology that can be used in various ways in the subway system to replace legacy gate types.

78. Would you guys please expand on the "preventing Fare Evasion" with the Faregates? What is the main goal, fully block tailgating? Minimizing, but being sensible about it?

MTA Response: The MTA is seeking modern fare gates that minimize opportunities for fare evasion and mitigates the key vulnerabilities demonstrated in current fare equipment.

Fare evasion has become a critical challenge for the MTA, leading to \$285 million in annual fare loss for the subway system. Common fare evasion tactics include jumping over or ducking under the low turnstile, piggybacking or back-cocking in the low turnstile, and entering through the emergency exit gate. The MTA has also begun a pilot of paddle-gates at select fare arrays. Through this pilot, the MTA has observed that most common evasion tactics for these types of gates has been piggybacking or reaching around to the paid side of the adjacent lane to open the gate for entry from the unpaid side.

79. Will the entire installation be included/funded in the MTA's 2025-29 capital plan?

MTA Response: MTA will seek to include initial procurements from the QPL in the 2025-2029 Capital Plan.

80. Over what time period (i.e. years) does the MTA envision replacing all of its existing fare gates?

MTA Response: The MTA has not made a determination regarding the timing and sequence of deployment of the new gates across the system.

81. What is the anticipated scale/quantities of the strategic deployment?

MTA Response: The MTA will determine the scale of strategic deployment based on the quality and efficacy of the proposed gates to meet stated objectives around enhancing the customer experience and accessibility and ensuring fare compliance through reducing fare evasion, as well as available funding. See answer to related Question No. 80.

82. In the introduction, it appears that the MTA intends to use WAGs and AWAGs to replace just low turnstiles, Automated Fare Access System Gates, and Emergency Exit Gates (EXGs). Yet there are many points of entry/exit to the subway that are only equipped with HEETs, either for exit only, or for exit and entry, but only if the customer has MTA fare media in hand. 1) With regard to this type of HEET deployment, does the MTA plan to replace these HEETs with either WAGs or AWAGs, or does MTA envision the need for a third WAG design for deployments at these points of entry? 2) In cases where HEETs are deployed in a mixed array of LT, AFAS, and Emergency Exit Gates, does the MTA plan to use WAGs and AWAGs replace these HEETs?

MTA Response: The MTA does not envision need for a third design to accommodate HEETs. Replacement of HEETs with new fare gates will be determined on a station-by-station basis.

VII. QPL Timing & Requirements

83. Has the MTA small business participation percentage been established for this project?

MTA Response: No, there is no participation percentage established at this point in pre-qualification.

84. Does the MTA anticipate issuing an RFP in 2024?

MTA Response: This RFI-QPL process is anticipated to take one year or less to complete. Therefore, there's a very small chance that the actual purchase of gates will occur in 2024. In addition, once the QPL listing is established, the initial purchase of the gates will still require some planning and funding allocation prior to releasing the bid solicitation.

85. Is there an approximate expected target date for Phase 2 of the RFI (testing of QPL Gates that have met the requirements of the RFI)?

MTA Response: The MTA targets qualification for Phase 2 within the first or second quarter of 2024 and testing to begin in the second quarter.

86. Once RFI responses are in, how soon thereafter will MTA issue its decision on qualified proposers/products?

MTA Response: The MTA will make a determination following thorough review of all submissions.

87. The key dates during the Proposer Conference are not 100% in line with the phase descriptions in the RFI. Can you please elaborate your expectations on "Phase 2 Qualification" regarding functional scope and testing scope?

MTA Response: Phase 2 Qualification is estimated to begin in 2nd Quarter 2024. Proposers must submit as part of their RFI response their standard test plan for their proposed gate. The MTA plans to review and approve test plans following qualification of Phase 2 applicants prior to testing. See RFI document, page 11, section II.2 (Evaluation of Fare Gates).

88. When do you plan to release the MTA approved Test Plan relevant for "Phase 2A: Lab Tests"?

MTA Response: Proposers must submit as part of their RFI response their standard test plan for their proposed gate. The MTA plans to review and approve test plans following qualification of Phase 2 applicants. See RFI document, page 11, section II.2 (Evaluation of Fare Gates).

89. At which point in time will the funds source be secured (hence final federal/state terms be stabilized)?

MTA Response: Funding will be secured prior to the issuance of any RFP to the proposers on the QPL.

90. Can a Firm submit multiple gates as part of the RFI process or are they limited to one recommended version of a WAG and AWAG?

MTA Response: Yes, proposers may submit multiple gates that meet the technical requirements in the RFI.

91. Could you explain how procurements will be managed by MTA for gates successfully placed in QPL? Will it be managed over a competitive bidding process? or something different?

MTA Response: Future competitive RFPs will be issued to firms qualified on the QPL.

92. As described in the RFI, Phases 2-4 of the RFI process would appear to complete a full design review and testing process up to and including the In-Revenue Service Test (IRST) at a representative number of stations. 1) Can the MTA please confirm that only those proposers who have qualified through the RFI process will be considered in the RFP phase? 2) Can the MTA please elaborate on the criteria and evaluation process for the next phase in the procurement process?

MTA Response:

1) MTA's purpose is to qualify products (not proposers). Only those gates that are deemed qualified will be considered for future purchases. Any proposer that can deliver the qualified products can compete for future procurement of those qualified gates.

2) Once a proposed gate successfully passes through the RFI phases 1 through 3 based on the criteria detailed in the RFI document, the proposer will be notified and the QPL process will begin which will allow the MTA to purchase the qualified product in the future.

93. QPL Process and Purchasing Process

a. Can MTA please share the projected time schedule for the QPL Process Phases 1, 2a, 2b, 3?

MTA Response: The MTA targets qualification for Phase 2 in the first or second quarter of 2024 and testing to begin in the second quarter. The MTA targets testing for Phase 3 in the second half of 2024.

b. What is MTA's expectation of the quarter and year of first purchase order and related serial delivery based on successful completed QPL Process?

MTA Response: The MTA intends to release an RFP following qualification of proposers on the QPL. Exact timing of future RFPs has not been determined.

c. Does there exist an outline of the purchasing process and timelines based on a gate once it has been successfully placed on the QPL?

MTA Response: Once a qualified product is successfully placed in the QPL, a standard bidding process (IFB) will be conducted. IFB (Information for Bid) using QPL follows the standard bidding procedures and could take 3 months to complete.

d. Section V.A. reads "*The MTA is currently piloting an AWAG/WAG product at several stations including Sutphin Blvd-Archer Av-JFK Airport station, a major point of connection to the airport.*" What gates are piloted there – manufacture and model? How is this piloting linked to the QPL process?

MTA Response: The pilot deploys (6) Cubic E4.1 Standard Aisle Gates and (4) Cubic E4.1 AWAGs in system. The pilot is unrelated to this QPL process.

94. When does NYC Metro have a schedule for release of an RFP/RFQ for the replacement of all of their faregates, TVMs and OMNY/NFPS back-end systems?

MTA Response: Replacement schedule for fare gates have not been determined at this time. The

replacement of the MetroCard vending machines is underway already, with the installation of the new OMNY vending machines that commenced in October 2023. There is no replacement planned for the OMNY back end, it is relatively new.

95. Once an RFP/RFQ has been issued and awarded, what is the expected rough timeline for design-manufacturing of physical replacement equipment, as well as installation start date, and completion target date?

MTA Response: The MTA has not yet set a schedule for gate installations based on the new QPL. MTA expects proposers to include their anticipated timeline for manufacturing, testing, and installation in their proposals.

96. Is the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Buy America requirements are not applicable to your future Fare Gate purchase?

MTA Response: The MTA does not currently envision applying Buy America requirements to the RFI process or near-term fare gate purchases. However, proposers should indicate whether proposed fare gates do (or in the future may) meet Buy America requirements.

97. Since this is not an official solicitation, is the understanding correct that qualified participants gates to be tested in Phase 2 and 3 need not be compliant to Buy America provisions at this juncture?

MTA Response: The MTA does not currently envision applying Buy America requirements to the RFI process or near-term fare gate purchases. However, proposers should indicate whether proposed fare gates do (or in the future may) meet Buy America requirements.

98. Is there any Federal/State requirement for qualified participants to provide a BA compliant AWAG and WAG for the Lab Tests in Phase 2 and subsequent In-Service Tests in Phase 3?

MTA Response: The MTA does not currently envision applying Buy America requirements to the RFI process or near-term fare gate purchases. However, proposers should indicate whether proposed fare gates do (or in the future may) meet Buy America requirements.

99. Can the participant's production lab be located overseas, or does it be located within the 5 boroughs of New York City?

MTA Response: The production lab where testing is to be conducted for Phase 2 does not need to be located in New York City. However, if possible, the lab should be located domestically, or the gates be capable of being shipped to the United States for testing domestically.

100. Assuming that more than one proposer will be qualified to bid, would the MTA ever envision using multiple providers for fare gates?

MTA Response: The MTA is open to multiple providers for fare gates, to be selected from the proposers with products on the QPL, and subject to the MTA's needs and the procurement process at the time.

101. Page #5 of yesterday's (1/17) presentation stated "At the time of need, standard IFB solicitation process will be followed - awarded to the lowest bidder for the prequalified product." Will MTA only consider the cheapest option, or will their decision be based on a gate's longevity & functionality to ensure New Yorkers

receive the pinnacle of customer experience?

MTA Response: The MTA intends that all proposers that are qualified will have demonstrated value, including longevity and functionality, through the QPL process.

VIII. Testing & Evaluation

102. Does the MTA intend to develop its own test plan that would apply to all proposers?

MTA Response: Yes, the MTA intends to develop a uniform Test Plan based on submissions of test plans from proposers as part of the RFI response.

103. Will proposers have the opportunity to comment on its Test Plan prior to its final issuance?

MTA Response: Yes.

104. As the QPL Process includes several tests: What is the foreseen technical qualification process (test and inspection scope) as part of the purchasing process?

MTA Response: The QPL process is for pre-qualifying products based on a technical qualification process. There will not necessarily be any further technical qualification process required during a procurement for a gate from the gate QPL.

105. For the proposed gates that will be used for evaluation, is MTA looking to have a working gate that is currently deployed, or can the participant opt to propose a prototype gate that would better meet MTA's requirements.

MTA Response: The MTA is open to considering both gates that are currently in use by other systems as well as prototypes, provided they meet technical requirements, pass all testing phases, and can be produced by expected procurement date.

106. Can MTA advise the lead time that would be provided to participants for supplying a AWAG and WAG for Phase 2 if they are selected.

MTA Response: MTA expects proposers to offer best and realistic lead time scenarios.

107. Can you detail your expectations on the Phase 2A Lab Tests at the suppliers' facilities?

MTA Response: The testing of the gate should show the full functionality of all features of the gate including but not limited to sensor detection, throughput, fault reporting, and any maintenance application.

108. Will you travel internationally for 2A if necessary?

MTA Response: International travel will be evaluated on a case by case and necessity basis. The MTA would prefer if proposers can make best efforts to demonstrate products domestically.

IX. Other Clarifications

109. Please confirm there is no Attachment 1 that should be part of this RFI:

MTA Response: Confirmed.

110. For the sake of clarity, please indicate whether the MTA requires Attachment 2 to be completed for every "product," component, and sub-component included in the fabrication of WAGs/AWAGs.

MTA Response: An Attachment 2 should be completed for every qualified gate (which would cover all parts, components, sub-components and manufacturing of that qualified product).

111. What are some of the cost items that a proposer participating in this QPL process can expect to share with MTA or is all costs incurred throughout the process of the QPL borne by the participant.

MTA Response: Costs incurred by the proposer through the RFI/QPL process are borne by the proposer.

112. Will NYCT please extend the due date for RFI responses by not less than 4 weeks, given the clarifications provided by NYCT during the Pre-RFI conference this week, some of which will require additional time and due diligence for proposers to provide thorough and fully responsive RFI responses?

MTA Response: The deadline for RFI responses has now been scheduled for close of business on Friday, March 8th, 2024.

113. Could MTA please confirm that it is seeking a single "qualified product" or a "number of qualified products" from different vendors? If MTA seeks a single qualified product, describe how the RFP process will be conducted since the single qualified product (i.e., hardware and software) will likely consist of solutions and details that are proprietary?

MTA Response: MTA is anticipating to qualify multiple gates that meet the technical specifications, regardless if they're proposed by the same proposer or multiple proposers.

114. Could the MTA please confirm that once a qualified product, or products, are identified it intends to open bidding in the IFP/RFP phase to any vendor, not just those vendors who participated in the RFI process and became qualified to participate in Phases 2-3

MTA Response: Confirmed. MTA intends to conduct a competitive solicitation at the time that the need arises for purchase of one or more qualified gates.

115. If a vendor does not participate in the RFI process, will that vendor be barred from bidding on the qualified product during the IFP/RFP phase?

MTA Response: No vendor will be barred from bidding on any future purchase of qualified product(s).

116. In preparing its Amendment for release on 1/31/24, could the MTA please reference written documentation that details the process for determining a "qualified product" and for the IFB/RFP/procurement phase of that qualified product?

MTA Response: The RFI document details the process on how a product can be qualified. The future

purchase of qualified gates will follow standard bidding process and procedures which can be shared with the successful proposers of the qualified products.