Questions to Gohio Platform RFP- Updated October 19, 2026

1. **Ownership of Products (p.13). Section V states that OARC will retain copyright to all "software, software source code" developed under the contract. Does this apply to a vendor's pre-existing, commercially licensed platform, or only to deliverables developed specifically for OARC? Would OARC accept a license to the platform, with OARC owning all program data and custom deliverables?**

   Answer: This does not include the vendor's pre-existing, commercially licensed platform. OARC would only own program data.

2. **Budget (p.10). Does the anticipated annual budget of $100,000–$111,000 include incentive and reward funds (e.g., gift cards, prizes, Guaranteed Ride Home reimbursements), or only software, hosting, implementation and support? Must first-year implementation and data conversion fit within the same annual amount?**

   Answer: The budget doesn't include incentives and prizes. The budget is all exclusive and would include software, hosting, implementation, support, first-year implementation and data conversion.

3. **Data migration (pp.5, 9). Will the current vendor be required to provide a complete export of program data (users, trip history, point balances, employers, park-and-rides, vanpools and transportation providers) to the selected vendor, and to support the transition through June 30, 2027?**

   Answer: Yes, the current vendor would be required to provide all user data to the new vendor and would need to support the program till the end of their contract on June 30, 2027.

4. **Mobile applications (pp.2, 6). Does OARC intend for the Gohio Commute mobile apps to continue to be published under the selected vendor's developer account, or to be published under an OARC or MORPC developer account going forward? Would a single statewide Gohio app with MPO-branded experiences satisfy the requirement for branded native applications, or does each MPO require its own app listing?**

   Answer: OARC expects the selected vendor to provide a Gohio Commute–branded native mobile app and publish and maintain it in the applicable app stores under the vendor's developer account, at the vendor's expense. The current app is proprietary to the current vendor.

   A single statewide Gohio Commute app with MPO-specific branding is acceptable; separate app listings for each MPO are not required.

5. **Current usage (p.5). Would it be possible for OARC to share current usage figures, such as registered users, monthly active users, trips logged per year, participating employers and active vanpools, to help proposers size the solution?**

   Answer: The following numbers are approximate. 25, 375 registered users, 30,500 trips logged, 54 active vanpools, and 614 participating employers.

6. **Gohio Mobility (p.7). Could OARC share the approximate number of providers currently listed in Gohio Mobility, the information included in a provider profile, and who maintains the listings today (for example, county mobility managers)?**

   Answer: Approximately 656 providers are currently listed in Gohio Mobility. The database is maintained by each county's mobility manager. Provider profile information is proprietary.

7. **Vanpool (p.6). Which participating MPOs operate vanpool programs?**

   Answer: Three MPO's have vanpool programs.

8. **Which fleet provider(s) serve each, and about how many active vans and riders are there?**

   Answer: Fleet vendor is Enterprise for all programs. Approximately:54 vans and 460 participants.

9. **Please describe the current workflow from a rider's inquiry to an active seat: who receives join requests, approves riders, assigns seats and manages waitlists, and which steps take place in the Gohio platform, in the fleet provider's systems, or with MPO staff.**

   Answer: Proprietary information.

10. **Which system is the system of record for vans, rosters, seat availability and waitlists?**

    Answer: Both Gohio Commute and vanpool vendor.

11. **Please describe any current data exchange between the Gohio platform and the fleet provider(s): data elements (e.g., rosters, seats, vehicle information, monthly mileage and ridership), method (API, scheduled file transfer or manual entry), frequency and direction.**

    Answer: Proprietary information.

12. **Is technical documentation available to proposers?**

    Answer: Proprietary information.

13. **Does the fleet provider's agreement require it to provide data access or APIs to the platform vendor OARC selects, and will OARC facilitate that access during implementation?**

    Answer: Proprietary information.

14. **When administrators add vans or riders or place commuters on a waitlist in the platform (p.6), should those actions also update the fleet provider's systems, or will the platform serve as the record for these functions?**

    Answer: A preference was not stated in the RFP.

15. **Which vanpool reports must the platform produce (e.g., NTD ridership and mileage, subsidy calculations, employer reports), and is the platform expected to calculate subsidies or support billing?**

    Answer: Vanpool roster, van id, van schedule, open seats, vanpool maximum capacity, origin and destination, and contact information. The platform is not expected to calculate subsidies or support billing.

16. **Cost evaluation (pp.10–11). How will the Cost/Budget criterion (20%) be scored (e.g., a formula relative to the lowest cost, or qualitative)? Does OARC expect a best-and-final-offer round?**

    Answer: Qualitative review: Evaluators consider whether the proposed budget is reasonable and provides good value for the services offered, rather than scoring price alone. OARC does not anticipate conducting a best-and-final-offer round. Vendors should submit their most competitive pricing and proposed terms with their initial proposals.

17. **Contracting structure (p.10). Does OARC prefer a single agreement held by MORPC, or separate agreements with each MPO? How will costs be shared among partners?**

    Answer: Page 10 of the RFP states MORPC will be the prime holder on the contract on behalf of participating organizations.

18. **Federal requirements (pp.3–4, 13). Does this procurement carry a DBE participation goal? Are federal clauses or certification forms required with the proposal beyond those described in the RFP?**

    Answer: This is no DBE participation goal required, and no federal clauses or certification forms required with the proposal beyond those described in the RFP.

19. **Existing integrations (pp.4–6). Which third-party integrations are live today (e.g., transit agency feeds, rewards vendors, GRH providers) and must be maintained at launch?**

    Answer: Transit agency feed, reward vendor, GRH/Emergency ride home redemption must be provided at launch.

20. **Proposal format (pp.7–8). Is a page limit or font/format requirement applied to the proposal? Do resumes, references and appendices count toward it?**

    Answer: The RFP does not establish a page limit or specify font type, font size, margins, or spacing. Proposals should be concise, clearly organized, and follow the section order outlined on pages 7–8. Resumes/CVs, references, and appendices are not subject to a page limit. All required proposal information must be included.

21. **Accessibility (pp.6–7). Is WCAG 2.2 AA conformance to be demonstrated at proposal submission (e.g., by a third-party audit or an Accessibility Conformance Report), or by the July 1, 2027 launch? Will a current Accessibility Conformance Report with a documented remediation plan be accepted at the proposal stage?**

    Answer: Full WCAG 2.2 Level AA conformance is required by the July 1, 2027 launch. At the proposal stage, OARC will accept a current Accessibility Conformance Report accompanied by a documented remediation plan identifying outstanding issues, corrective actions, and a timeline for achieving conformance before launch. A third-party accessibility audit is not required at proposal submission.

22. **To support full and open competition, will OARC confirm that evaluation criteria and scoring weightings are structured to assess all proposers on equal footing, independent of prior program history or existing platform familiarity? Will any incumbent-held knowledge, integrations, or transition advantages be normalized in scoring? Additionally, will OARC clarify its objectives for this procurement — specifically, whether the intent is continuity of the current platform or genuine evaluation of alternative platforms and delivery models — so proposers can scope their responses appropriately and OARC can realize the full benefit of a competitive ,field?**

    Answer: All proposals will be evaluated using the criteria and weightings published on page 11: General Quality and Adequacy of Response (5%), Qualifications (15%), Transportation Demand Management Technology (30%), Mobility Search Tool (25%), Innovations (5%), and Cost/Budget (20%). Prior experience with OARC or familiarity with the current platform is not identified as a separate scoring criterion.

The RFP does not establish a scoring adjustment or normalization process for incumbent knowledge, integrations, or transition advantages. Relevant qualifications, system capabilities, and implementation and migration plans will be assessed under the published criteria.

The procurement seeks a solution that meets or exceeds OARC's statewide commute and mobility needs. Alternative platforms and approaches that address the scope are welcome, and vendors are encouraged to propose innovations. Continuity of public access and migration of existing data are required objectives; retaining the current vendor's platform is not a stated requirement. (RFP, pp. 4–5, 9, and 11–12.)

23. **For the 7 MPO subsites, does each MPO need the ability to independently configure incentive rules, matching parameters, participation agreement terms, admin permissions, and reporting access, or are these controlled centrally? If per-site control is required, how many distinct administrative role types are expected per subsite?**

    Answer: The platform must preserve regional control and provide configurable subsites that support independent branding, content, features, reports, and data access, as authorized by OARC. Role-based permissions are mandatory for MPO administrators and authorized sub-administrators, including employer, transportation coordinators and mobility managers. Administrators must also be able to enable or disable optional integrations by subsite when applicable.

    The RFP does not expressly require independent MPO configuration of every item listed in the question, particularly matching parameters and participation agreement terms. Integrated incentive management and additional subsite configuration capabilities are identified as desirable features. Proposers should explain which settings can be managed independently by each MPO, which are centrally controlled, and any limitations.

    No fixed number of administrative role types is specified per subsite. Proposers should describe their available roles, permission controls, and any associated costs. (RFP, pp. 4–7 and 9.)

24. **At the end of the contract term or in the event of early termination, what are OARC's expectations for data export, format, and transition support? Will the selected vendor be required to provide a complete, structured export of all platform data including commuter profiles, vanpool rosters, trip logs, incentive history, and reporting data? Separately, please confirm proposers must disclose ownership structure, corporate parent, and recent M&A history, and whether changes in ownership during the contract term trigger OARC's right to review.**

    Answer: OARC ownership of all program data is a stated requirement. The RFP also requires reporting exports in Excel, CSV, and PDF formats and an implementation plan addressing migration from the incumbent system.

    However, the RFP does not specify a complete end-of-contract or early-termination export, an exit-export schema, or the duration, scope, and cost of outgoing transition assistance. It therefore does not expressly require the comprehensive export described in the question. Proposers should describe their capabilities for exporting commuter profiles, vanpool rosters, trip logs, incentive history, reporting data, and other program records, including available formats, documentation, transition assistance, and costs. Detailed exit requirements should be addressed during contract development.

    The proposal must identify the firm's legal entity and provide organizational structure, corporate qualifications, and project personnel affiliations. The RFP does not expressly require disclosure of corporate ownership, a corporate parent, or recent merger and acquisition history, nor does it

establish an automatic review right triggered by a change in ownership. Any additional disclosure requirements or ownership-change provisions would need to be established through an RFP amendment or the final contract, as appropriate. (RFP, pp. 4, 6, 8–9, and 13–14.)

25. **How are vanpool and carpool matches verified today, and what verification is expected going forward?**

    The RFP does not prescribe a specific verification method. Going forward, the platform must support matching based on relevant trip and user criteria.

    Answer: Vendors should describe how their proposed solution verifies matches and identify any limitations.

26. **What automated outreach tools does the current platform provide, and what is expected going forward?**

    Answer: Current automated outreach tools are considered proprietary program information and are not available for disclosure.

    Vendors should describe their outreach tools and describe how the tools will help with our programs.

27. **Is WCAG 2.1 acceptable, or is WCAG 2.2 required?**

    Answer: Vendors should address WCAG 2.2 Level AA, as identified in the RFP, for public and administrative interfaces. Any departure from this standard must be clearly identified in the proposal, along with a remediation plan. WCAG 2.1 conformance alone should not be assumed to satisfy the requirement.

28. **Should existing members' trip logs be transferred, and how far back should they go?**

    Answer: The RFP requires migration of existing platform data and related program records. It does not establish a historical cutoff for trip logs.

    Vendors should describe their ability to migrate historical trip logs and clearly identify any proposed limits or assumptions.

29. **What transit and approved third-party integrations exist today, and what is expected going forward?**

    Answer: The RFP identifies transit and approved third-party integrations as current capabilities but does not provide a specific inventory.

    Vendors should identify their available integrations.

30. **Can OARC provide examples of integrations that can be enabled or disabled by subsite?**

    Answer: The requirement allows each MPO to control optional integrations according to its regional needs. For example, an approved transit information integration could be enabled for an MPO whose region is served by that transit provider. This is an illustrative example; the RFP does not identify specific current integrations with this capability.

31. **How many incentives are managed today, and how are they fulfilled?**

    Answer: Current incentive volumes and fulfillment details are considered proprietary program information and are not available for disclosure.

    Vendors should describe their tools for administering incentives and rewards, available fulfillment methods, and any related fees or administrative responsibilities.

32. **How many people manage incentives?**

    Answer: Each MPO manages their own incentive program.

    Vendors should explain how multiple authorized administrators can manage programs within their assigned permissions and identify any administrator licensing limits.

33. **How many administrators currently have access to update public-facing content and configure subsites?**

    Answer: Current administrator counts are considered proprietary information and are not available for disclosure. Vendors should describe their role-based permissions, administrator capacity, and any licensing limits or costs.

    The RFP identifies authorized administrator control of public-facing content, branding, features, reports, and integrations as desirable functionality.

34. **To what extent are employer transportation programs managed on the platform today?**

    Answer: Current employer program participation and usage information is proprietary and is not available for disclosure. The RFP describes the expected functionality, including configurable employer subsites and permissions for authorized employer transportation coordinators.

35. **What is the frequency of use of the Emergency Ride Home benefit?**

    Answer: Current Emergency Ride Home utilization figures are considered proprietary program information and are not available for disclosure. Vendors should describe their ability to support an Emergency or Guaranteed Ride Home program that can be configured or disabled by subsite.

36. **What is the usage of Commute AI assistance, and does the current vendor charge an additional usage-based fee?**

    Answer: Current Commute AI utilization and vendor-specific pricing information are considered proprietary and are not available for disclosure. AI-assisted commute guidance is listed as desirable functionality.

    Vendors should describe their proposed capabilities and clearly identify any subscription, transaction, or usage-based charges.

37. **Does the current platform support communication within the platform, and how does this differ from desirable in-system messaging?**

    Answer: The RFP does not detail the current platform's messaging implementation. Communication within the platform is included in the mandatory matching requirement, while in-system messaging is separately listed as desirable.

    Vendors must explain how users communicate to support carpool and vanpool matching and join requests and should also describe any broader messaging capabilities.

38. **Will company-prepared financial statements be sufficient, and are hourly rates required if the company does not bill hourly?**

    Answer: The RFP requires the selected firm to provide its latest audited financial statement and average hourly rates for assigned personnel before negotiations. These are not proposal submission requirements.

    Selected vendors without these materials should clearly identify the requested exception, describe the alternative financial documentation available, and explain their pricing model.

39. **Can a redacted proposal be submitted?**

Answer: Redacted proposals will not be accepted.

40. will OARC consider a newly custom-built or hybrid solution that meets all mandatory functional, security, accessibility, and performance requirements, and will such proposals be evaluated on equal terms with established COTS platforms?

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution.

41. For a newly built solution, may the bidder demonstrate its capabilities through a working prototype and evidence of comparable enterprise/public-sector projects instead of existing TDM or ridematching product deployments?

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution

42. **Can Gohio Commute and Gohio Mobility operate on a shared backend and administrative architecture while maintaining their respective brands, features, and user experiences?**

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution

43. Would mobile applications built with cross-platform frameworks such as Flutter or React Native satisfy the requirement for branded native iOS and Android apps if distributed through the respective app stores and meeting all relevant standards?

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution

44. **Are bidders free to select the proposed programming languages, application frameworks, databases, and infrastructure stack, provided all RFP requirements are met?**

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution

45. **Beyond the stated proposal sections, does OARC prescribe any page limits, mandatory templates, formatting rules, or restrictions on supporting appendices?**

Answer: No limit

46. **Should the cost proposal be submitted separately from the technical response, and is a specific pricing form or breakdown required?**

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution

47. **Will proposals be reviewed and scored solely by the designated evaluation committee, or will automated/AI-based screening or scoring also play a role?**

Answer: It will be reviewed and scored by the evaluation committee.

48. Will bidders be invited to demonstrate the proposed platform or prototype, and how would any demonstration affect evaluation?

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution

49. How will OARC assess comparable IT implementation experience outside the transportation demand management domain when scoring vendor qualifications?

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution

50. Are out-of-state U.S. companies eligible to bid and receive award without an established Ohio office, and does any local-vendor preference apply?

Answer: Vendor does not need to be local.

51. **What Ohio business registration or other state authorizations are required of an out-of-state prime contractor, and at what stage must they be completed?**

Answer: No requirements outside of what is listed in the RFP.

52. **Is a permanent or periodic onsite presence required for implementation, training, or support, or may these services be delivered remotely?**

Answer: Onsite training or support is not required

53. **Is subcontracting permitted, and must each proposed subcontractor and its scope be identified in the proposal?**

Answer: Subcontracting is not permitted

54. **May a U.S.-based prime contractor utilize offshore development and QA personnel, subject to the prime remaining contractually responsible?**

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution so this question is probably not appliable.

55. **Are there restrictions on offshore access to production systems or personal information, or citizenship/residency requirements for project personnel?**

Answer: OARC will not consider a newly custom-built platform or Hybrid solution so this question is probably not appliable

56. Does this procurement contain any mandatory or preferred small-business, MBE, DBE, or other socioeconomic participation requirements?

Answer: None is required.

57. Does OARC have a required or preferred cloud hosting provider, or may the vendor propose a suitable cloud architecture of its choice?

Answer: OARC does not host their own system, they will purchase from an established TDM software provider who host their own system

58. **Are U.S.-only hosting, backup, disaster recovery, or data-processing locations mandatory?**

Answer: It would be preferred.

59. Which third-party security attestations or assessments (such as SOC 2 Type II or penetration testing) are mandatory at proposal submission versus before production go-live?

Answer: Before production goes live.

60. Are specific identity integration, uptime, recovery time (RTO), and recovery point (RPO) requirements prescribed beyond those stated in the RFP?

Answer: Everything is stated in the RFP

61. **Will OARC own newly developed custom source code, and may vendors retain rights to their pre-existing reusable frameworks, libraries, and proprietary technology?**

62. **For AI-assisted commuter capabilities, may vendors use third-party AI services under appropriate privacy and security controls, or are there hosting/model restrictions?**

63. **Does OARC expect complete replacement of both incumbent applications, or may the selected vendor retain or integrate existing components where appropriate?**

64. **Will OARC provide incumbent data dictionaries, schemas, machine-readable exports, and reasonable technical assistance for migration?**

65. **Can OARC provide indicative volumes of active users, historical trips, incentives, and provider records, along with expected concurrency, to support accurate sizing and pricing?**

66. **Which existing third-party APIs and transportation-service integrations must be functional at initial go-live, and which may be delivered in subsequent phases?**

67. **Should third-party subscription, API usage, mapping, messaging, and app-store charges be included within the vendor's proposed price, or are any such charges paid directly by OARC?**

68. **If OARC accepts a custom-built solution, may the vendor go live by July 1, 2027 with a mutually approved minimum set of core features, followed by delivery of the remaining required features within one to two months under an agreed release schedule?**

    Answer: OARC will not accept a custom-built solution

69. **If phased delivery is permitted, how will OARC determine the minimum launch scope and apply acceptance criteria to features scheduled for post-launch releases?**

    Answer: A phased delivery would not be accepted.

70. **Is July 1, 2027 a mandatory production launch date for both Gohio applications, or the start of the implementation/operating contract period?**

    Answer: Yes

71. **Is the vendor expected to provide hosting, maintenance, help desk, security updates, and operational support throughout the full three-year base term and any exercised one-year extensions?**

    Answer: Yes

72. **What support coverage and response/service-level targets are expected for routine incidents and after-hours critical production issues?**

    Answer: System is expected to work 24/7

73. **Is the stated annual budget a hard ceiling, and may one-time implementation and data-migration fees be itemized separately from recurring annual costs?**

    Answer: Hard ceiling

74. **Are continuous feature enhancements included in the annual fee, or may additional functionality outside the baseline scope be priced via change orders?**

    Answer: no additional funding

75. **At contract expiration, what transition assistance, data export, and knowledge transfer obligations will apply?**

    Answer: Full transition support is expected.

76. **Which programming languages, frameworks, and other technologies does the existing platform use?**

    Answer: Proprietary information.

77. **The requirements section says "secure cloud hosting". Does the MORPC require using one of the major cloud providers (e.g. Amazon Web Services, Google Cloud, Microsoft Azure), or would MORPC be open to using a secure hosting environment provided by the vendor?**

    Answer: MORPC does not host the Gohio Commute rideshare platform. The platform is hosted on the vendor's site.

78. **Data export: The October 8 response to question 3 says the current vendor will provide all user data. Will that export also include the Gohio Mobility provider records, along with their field definitions?**

    Answer: Yes, it will include provider information

79. **Domains: Does OARC own the gohiocommute.com domain and the Gohio Mobility web address, and will DNS control pass to the new vendor for the July 1, 2027 cutover?**

    Answer: This are owned by MORPC and controlled by our IT department.

80. **MPO participation: Will all seven member MPOs participate at launch?**

    Answer: Yes, they will

81. **The October 8 response to question 7 says three MPOs have vanpool programs; which three are they?**

    Answer : Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland

82. **Gohio Mobility address: May Gohio Mobility launch at its own web address, with the current** gohiocommute.com/#/mobility **link redirected to it?**

    Answer: It redirects to it.