Clear Form

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
SCHOOL BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
Procurement Management Services
1450 N.E. 2nd Avenue, Room 650
Miami, FL 33132

Direct All Inquiries To
Procurement Management Services
Buyer's Name: Yusbel Gonzalez, CPPB
PHONE: (305) 995- 4203
Email: yusbelg@dadeschools.net
TDD PHONE: (305) 995-2400

BID/RFP ADDENDUM

Date: 6/18/2026

Addendum No. 4

BID/RFP No. RFI-25-050-YG BID/RFP TITLE: Student Transportation System Assessment

This addendum modifies the conditions of the above-referenced BID/RFP as follows:

Please see the attached answers to the questions received.

All other terms and conditions of the RFI will remain the same.

All information, specifications terms, and conditions for the above-referenced BID/RFP, are included on the document posted on the Procurement Management website at http://procurement.dadeschools.net

The attached pages containing clarifications, additional information and requirements constitute an integral part of the referenced bid. If your bid/proposal has not been submitted, substitute the pages marked REVISED and mail your entire bid/proposal package.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum Number _____

PLEASE NOTE: If your firm has forwarded a copy of this bid/proposal to another vendor, it is your responsibility to forward him/her a copy of this addendum.

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT BELOW)

LEGAL NAME OF BIDDER: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE ZIP CODE: _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____ E-MAIL _____ FAX # _____

BY: SIGNATURE (Manual): _____
OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

NAME (Typed): _____ TITLE: _____
OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Request for Information (RFI)

RFI-25-050-YG

Student Transportation System Assessment for Operational Efficiency and Service Reliability

ADDENDUM NO. 4

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q1: About the RFI mentioned above, could you confirm that this is a new initiative and there have been no previous contracts established for this service before? If there has been a previous contract for this service, could you provide the contract #, value, and expiration?

A1: This is a new initiative; therefore, there is no prior contract or historical spending data available for these specific services.

Q2: Will participation in this engagement preclude a firm from providing home-to-school transportation services to Miami-Dade County Public Schools in the future?

A2: No.

Q3: Can the District please provide the anticipated timeline for when the services outlined in this RFI are expected to commence, including any target start date for the operational assessment?

A3: The District is currently in the information-gathering phase. A formal timeline for the commencement of services may be established if and when a subsequent formal solicitation is issued.

Q4: Does the District require submission of a full company organizational chart, or an organizational chart specific to the project team supporting the operational assessment?

A4: The Organizational Chart may be specific to the project team supporting the operational assessment.

Q5: Can the District provide an overview of the transportation technology systems currently in use, including routing software, GPS/telematics systems, field trip management tools, and any asset management platforms? Please specify the vendor(s) and platform(s) where applicable.

A5: BusPlannerPro: Routing software, BusPlanner GPS+: GPS hardware/software, BusPlannerTrips: Field trip management software, BusPlanner Fleet: Vehicle management software.

Q6: Will the awarded firm be provided access to a sandbox or test environment of the District's current transportation systems for analysis and scenario modeling?

A6: No. Please note that the purpose of this Request for Information (RFI) is to gauge the level of interest and technical capabilities from vendors knowledgeable and experienced in performing full operational reviews of the District's transportation system. Depending on the responses and level of interest received, the District may subsequently issue a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN).

Q7: Can the District clarify the current routing structure, including who is responsible for routing and the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff dedicated to this function?

A7: The routing department has 22 employees located at 2 offices. 15 Route Specialists responsible for routing, 2 Mapping Specialists, 2 Route Managers, 1 Transportation Operations Manager, 1 Coordinator, 1 Supervisor of Centralized Routing.

Q8: Can the District share any planned or anticipated changes that may impact transportation operations in the near term, such as bell time adjustments, boundary changes, school openings or closures, or programmatic shifts? Additionally, are there any initiatives currently under consideration that have not yet been finalized but may influence routing and service delivery?

A8: The District does not currently anticipate districtwide bell time changes. Boundary adjustments are reviewed annually. Schools opening/closing are decided by the Attendance Boundary Committee (ABC).

Q9: Will these potential changes be incorporated into any subsequent RFP or ITN, or should respondents account for them as part of their proposed approach?

A9: The District maintains discretion regarding whether and how any findings may be implemented, subject to priorities and available funding.

Q10: Does MDCPS Transportation have any existing performance based contracts? If so, what are the parameters?

A10: No.

Q11: General

1. Will any vendor interviews be conducted as part of the RFI?

2. Can you provide examples of what priority scenarios the district might want modeled? How many priority scenarios does the district expect to be modeled, and how many revision cycles should be assumed per scenario as part of the interactive reporting process?

3. Is a formal presentation to senior leadership, a selection committee, or the School Board expected as part of this engagement? If a presentation is required, does the district require onsite or virtual?

4. What is the desired date for starting the actual assessment project work?

5. What would the term of the contract be?

A11: Answers:

1. No. Vendor interviews are not conducted as part of the RFI process.
2. Enrollment growth or decline impacts, staff adjustments, budget allocation changes, & facility utilization planning. The district may want to model priority scenarios, with possible revisions to support refinement during the process.
3. No. Formal presentations are not part of the RFI process.
4. If the District decides to issue a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), the desired start date for commencing the assessment project work will be dependent on when the RFP or ITN is awarded.
5. If the District decides to issue a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), the contract term will be indicated in the solicitation document.

Q12: Demographics

1. What is the total number of vehicles in your fleet? Please break down by route buses, spares, special needs vans, shuttles, etc.

2. For home-to-school transportation, in which county(s) are you transporting students?

3. Can you please provide a breakdown of your transportation department with the types of roles and number of people in each role group?

4. How many total drivers does the district have?

A12: Answers:

1. 1007 buses, 25 vans
2. Miami-Dade County
3. This information will be made available if a subsequent RFP or ITN is issued after this RFI. .
4. 600

Q13: Contractors

1. Does the district own and operate the school bus fleet or are private contractors used?

2. If contracted, how many and what bus contractors are used?

3. If contracted, do contractor personnel use any of the district's routing software? If so, in what capacity (read only vs. editing routes, etc.)?

A13: Answers:

1. The District owns and operates the school bus fleet. In addition, 60 buses are privately contracted.
2. 60 are contracted
3. No.

Q14: GPS & Tablets

1. Is GPS hardware currently installed on district vehicles? If so, what type of hardware is installed and who is the vendor?

2. Does the district intend to continue using its current GPS technology?

3. Does the district have any tablets currently installed on district vehicles? If so, what type/model tablets are they and how many vehicles have them?

A14: Answers:

1. Yes, BusPlanner provides proprietary hardware
2. Yes
3. Yes, Samsung Galaxy Tab 3 installed on 950 vehicles

Q15: Bus Routes/Runs

1. Regarding the route structure for your bus runs, are you picking up K-12 all in one bus run (i.e., single tier)? Do you pick up high school students and drop them off, then pick up middle school students and drop off, and then elementary school (i.e., three tiers)?

2. What is the total number of individual runs/trips performed by all general education buses in the morning? (Ex: If 15 vehicles do a High School / Middle School run, then 17 vehicles do an Elementary run, that is 32 AM runs/trips total.)

3. How many general education runs/trips in the afternoon?

4. Are the afternoon bus runs essentially a 'mirror' of the morning runs? (Same core stop locations? Buses generally run in the same area AM & PM?)

5. How many special needs runs operate in the morning? How many in the afternoon?

A15: Answers:

1. The District utilizes a three-tier routing structure. This involves separate runs for High School, Middle School, and Elementary School levels.
2. 1,355
3. 1,362
4. Yes
5. Special needs students may be transported on shared or dedicated routes, depending on individual requirements.

Q16: Ridership

1. Does the District collect actual ridership data on individual bus runs? For clarification, we're looking for actual attendance on the bus by stop. If so,

a. Does the district currently utilize RFID scanners and RFID cards for students to swipe on and off the bus to track ridership? If yes, how many vehicles are equipped with RFID scanners?

2. If the District does not currently collect actual ridership in this manner, would it be possible to collect that information on a one-time basis?

A16: Answers:

1. Ridership data is collected during the October and February Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) survey periods.

    a. The District does not currently utilize RFID scanners or student swipe technology.

2. The District manually collects the ridership using a printed census report twice per year (Oct/Feb).

Q17: Can the District provide additional information regarding the transportation technology ecosystem currently in use, including routing software, GPS/AVL systems, student information systems, and parent communication platforms, as well as the level of integration and accessibility of operational data between those systems?

A17: The District's transportation ecosystem includes BusPlanner (Routing, GPS, and Fleet), Chipmunk (Parent Portal), and Finalsite (Mass communication to parents). Field hardware consists of Samsung tablets. The applications sync automatically.

Q18: Beyond the operational assessment and recommendation components outlined in the RFI, would the District anticipate any level of implementation support, operational change management, or ongoing optimization guidance as part of a future engagement?

A18: Any implementation support, change management, or ongoing optimization services may be part of a separate Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) and are not defined under this RFI.

Q19: Has the District previously completed transportation operational reviews, routing optimization studies, or modernization initiatives related to the objectives outlined in the RFI, and if so, would portions of those findings be made available to future proposers?

A19: The District has participated in prior reviews facilitated by the Council of the Great City Schools. Availability of any materials would be determined at a later stage.

Q20: What is the current route management system used by the district? Is there also a GPS system installed on the buses, and if so, who is the provider of that system? Then, is GPS data integrated with the route management system?

A20: The District utilizes BusPlanner for its route management system. GPS system is installed on the buses. BusPlanner provides routing and GPS service. GPS data is integrated with the route management system.

Q21: Have there been previous transportation efficiency and/or optimization studies at the district? If so, who performed the study (the district, an outside consultant, the district's software provider, etc.)? If such studies had been conducted, would the results be provided to the vendor selected to perform the contemplated study?

A21: Previous transportation-related reviews have included work associated with the Council of the Great City Schools. Any prior findings are not being distributed at this time as part of this RFI.

Q22: What is the current overall size of your district transportation system (i.e. Students, buses, runs/routes, drivers, schools, etc.)?

A22: 300,000 students, 1,000 buses and 300 schools. Please also refer to question 15 for additional information.

Q23: Is Special Needs transportation going to be part of this analysis?

A23: Yes.

Q24: Are any other student groups with mandated transportation going to be part of this analysis? For example, are McKinney-Vento students included?

A24: All students (including McKinney-Vento & Foster)

Q25: What is the expected timeline for this project? Specifically, When will the project start, and when is the delivery of results expected?

A25: If the District decides to issue a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), the expected timeline, project start date and delivery of results will be dependent on when the RFP or ITN is awarded.

Q26: What forms of data will be provided by the district for the duration of the project? Will a full copy of the district data be provided in this case (i.e. schools, stops, students (including specific transportation needs), runs, routes, depots, vehicles, etc.)? In what format will the vendor receive existing transportation data?

A26: Data, if provided, may be made available in CSV, Excel, or other standard formats.

Q27: Will a mapping source be provided by the district for the duration of the project?

A27: No. Maps used by routing department are provided by the Miami-Dade GIS webpage.

Q28: In addition to the report, will the district be requiring any data to be delivered for use after the project concludes (ex: implementation, internal reference, record-keeping)? What other deliverables are requested?

A28: This will be specified in a subsequent Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), depending on the responses and level of interest received under this RFI.

Q29: In addition to the report, will the district be requiring a presentation to the school board? Overall, how many in-person or virtual presentations of results are anticipated?

A29: Please refer to the answer provided in this addendum to Question 11, part 3.

Q30: Will the district want our Assessment to include analysis on the organizational/staffing structure of their transportation department?

A30: This will be specified in a subsequent Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), depending on the responses and level of interest received under this RFI.

Q31: We can model a variety of "what if" scenarios to meet the district needs. Are there any specific 'operational shifts' that the district would like to study and simulate as part of this project?

A31: This will be specified in a subsequent Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), depending on the responses and level of interest received under this RFI.

Q32: A focus on improving "on-time performance" is stated in the RFI – can the district expand on this, and provide some additional context on this current issue? For example, how is on-time performance currently recorded/analyzed? Is GPS data used to compare planned vs. actual arrival/departure times? Would that data be provided to the vendor? Does the district have a set policy regarding bus arrival/departure times at the schools? Would the district consider the modification of these times if it resulted in more efficient fleet allocations?

A32: On-time performance is done using GPS data. GPS data is used to compare planned vs. actual arrival/departure times. That data may be provided to the vendor if, as result of this RFI, a subsequent formal solicitation is issued chosen. The District has a set policy regarding bus arrival/departure times at the schools, which is 25 minutes before the bell time for breakfast. The district has previously considered the modification of bell times.

Q33: Will school bell-times be a focus in the efficiency analysis (because of the mention of the term 'scheduling structures? If so, does the district have an interest in changing its existing school bell-times?

A33: Bell time analysis may be provided if specified in a subsequent formal solicitation.

Q34: Does the current transportation system include the use of contractors? If so, what percentage of transportation is provided by them? How many routes are served by district drivers on district buses? How many are served by private contractors?

A34: The current transportation system includes the use of private contractors. There are 60 contracted routes served by private contractors, 612 are using district drivers.

Q35: What does the district consider to be the single most important benefit it would gain from this study?

A35: Efficiency of operations.

Q36: Exhibit A (Board Item H-8) is missing from the RFI document we have. The R.O.A.D. framework is mentioned four times as a cornerstone of the project, such as "In accordance with the District's adopted R.O.A.D. (Routes Opening Access to Dreams) Transportation Policy Framework, described in the attached Board agenda item H-8 (see Exhibit A)." So, can the district provide us with a copy of this framework?

A36: Exhibit A – Board Item H-8 is included as Exhibit A to RFI-25-050-YG. For quick access, it is included in this addendum as Attachment A.

Q37: We offer competitive rates and generous fee-structures to help meet the needs of cost-n districts over the long term. To better shape our response – is there a particular preference from the district between the fixed-fee, performance-based, or phased approaches?

A37: Please present all available options in your response.

Q38: Scope of the engagement relative to the broader R.O.A.D. Framework, and status of analyses completed to date.

The RFI's purpose statement (Sections 2.1–2.2) centers on routing efficiency, fleet utilization, on-time performance, and the reduction of non-service travel. The underlying R.O.A.D. Framework (Exhibit A / Item H-8) directs a broader review across seven domains — including (a) policy/eligibility cost-benefit (walk zones, courtesy busing, eligibility thresholds), (c) workforce capacity, (d) fleet, infrastructure, emissions and partnerships, (e) communications and engagement, (f) internal interactive dashboard capacity, and (g) an investment plan — with findings to be presented to the Fiscal Accountability and Government Relations Committee on April 15, 2026.

To help responders calibrate scope and pricing appropriately, could the District clarify:

a. Which ROAD analyses have been completed or presented internally to date, and where any preliminary findings can be accessed by responders?

b. Which of the broader ROAD components are intended to be in scope under this RFI (and any subsequent RFP or ITN), and which (if any) have been or will be addressed by District staff or other resources?

c. Whether the engagement contemplated under this RFI is primarily intended to be the comprehensive ROAD review, a focused operational efficiency study, or a third-party validation of work already underway?

A38: Answer:

A. No comprehensive third-party R.O.A.D. analysis has been released. Preliminary internal work has not been distributed through this RFI at this point.
B. This RFI is primarily focused on operational efficiency and service reliability (e.g., routing, fleet utilization, on-time performance, deadhead reduction). Other R.O.A.D. domains may be addressed separately by the district or in future phases and are not presumed fully in scope.
C. The RFI is intended to inform a focused operational efficiency assessment aligned to R.O.A.D., not to serve as the sole comprehensive framework review or a validation of completed external work.

Q39: Engagement model and division of labor between the District's Transportation Department and the selected vendor.

Section 2.2 references "District-directed priority scenario analyses," "initial optimization recommendations," and a "final assessment." To help responders propose an engagement model that aligns with the District's expectations and the Transportation Department's existing capacity:

a. How does the District envision the Transportation Department's role in the work? For example, will District staff produce baseline metrics, ridership audits, and route-level extracts (with the vendor providing independent analysis on top), or is the vendor expected to own end-to-end data ingestion, validation, root-cause analysis, and modeling?

**b. Will the engagement include on-site observation of dispatch, depots/compounds, and routing operations, as well as structured interviews with District staff, drivers, and school-based stakeholders? **

c. How is the District thinking about post-assessment implementation support (corrective action playbooks, route redesign execution, ongoing performance management, dashboards) — is that contemplated under this engagement, a possible follow-on, or expected to be carried out internally?

A39: Answer:

a. The District anticipates a collaborative model in which District staff support data access, while the vendor conducts independent analysis, modeling, and recommendations. Final roles may be defined in any subsequent solicitation.
b. On-site observations and interviews may be proposed but are not requirements of this RFI.
c. Implementation support is not included in this RFI and may be considered as a follow-on or separate effort.

Q40: Treatment of MDCPS-specific structural factors in benchmarking and scenario design.

Compared with peer Florida districts, MDCPS's transportation profile differs along several dimensions that materially affect efficiency metrics — including a higher weighted ESE transportation share, a substantial magnet/choice service footprint, a higher stops-per-rider ratio (likely tied to walking-safety and access policy), the District's fleet age profile, and Florida's FEFP ridership-based funding structure. Does the District prefer that the assessment:

a. Explicitly normalize peer benchmarks to control for these structural differences (e.g., ESE-adjusted occupancy and cost-per-rider; magnet-adjusted route-mile-per-rider);

b. Treat these factors as fixed constraints when modeling "what-if" scenarios; or

c. Include scenarios that test how potential changes to underlying policy or service-design drivers (eligibility, walk zones, stop spacing, tier/bell-time alignment, magnet service zones, ESE service differentiation) would affect efficiency, access, and equity?

Guidance here will help us calibrate the benchmarking framework and the breadth of the scenario set.

A40: Answer:

a. M-DCPS has unique structural factors that affect efficiency metrics and expects any peer benchmarking to reflect differences between districts/counties, with any normalization or adjustments clearly explained.
b. Responders may treat MDCPS-specific factors (such as ESE demand, magnet service, fleet profile, and funding structure) as operational constraints when modeling “what-if” scenarios.
c. The district may also consider scenarios that test the potential impacts of changes to underlying policy or service-design drivers; however, the breadth & prioritization of these scenarios will be determined by district direction in any subsequent solicitation.

Q41: Anticipated budget, fee structure, and procurement pathway

Section 3.1.C(b) invites conceptual approaches to financing — including fixed-fee, performance-based, and phased models — and Section 2.2 notes that the District may issue a subsequent RFP or ITN depending on the responses received. To allow responders to propose a structure aligned with the District's budget realities and procurement preferences:

a. Is there an anticipated budget range or not-to-exceed amount for this engagement, and a preferred funding source (operating vs. capital; district vs. external/grant)?

b. Would the District consider procurement, in whole or in part, via existing cooperative purchasing agreements such as TIPS-USA or the Allied States Cooperative as an alternative or supplement to a stand-alone RFP/ITN?

c. What is the District's current best estimate for the timeline from this RFI to any subsequent RFP/ITN, the desired engagement start date and overall period of performance, and whether a single award or multiple awards is anticipated (for example, separating policy/access analyses from operational/routing analyses)?

A41: Answer:

a. No budget or not-to-exceed amount has been established.
b. While the District may consider the use of cooperative purchasing agreements, the current intent is to utilize the information from this RFI to determine the most appropriate procurement path, which may include a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN).
c. No post-RFI timeline, award structure, or start date has been finalized. Details will be provided if a subsequent RFP or ITN is issued.

Q42: Data sources, access protocols, and timing

The pace and rigor of the analysis will depend on timely access to a defined dataset, including but not limited to: BusPlanner route and stop exports; bell times; vehicle and depot/compound assignments; planned vs. actual run times; GPS / on-time performance summaries; ridership confirmations and missed-trip logs; fleet inventory (age, capability, lift readiness) and maintenance/downtime indicators; and transportation budget and expenditure detail. Could the District describe:

a. Which of the above data sources are already centrally available and in what formats?

b. Any data-sharing approval steps that the vendor should plan for (Data Sharing Agreement, FERPA review, security review, etc.)?

c. The typical window between contract execution and full data access, so responders can propose realistic mobilization timelines and milestones?

A42: Answer:

a. Core transportation data are maintained in District systems; specific datasets & formats will be defined in any subsequent solicitation.

b. Data access will require appropriate approvals, including privacy and security compliance (e.g., Data Sharing Agreement, FERPA). Full data access will occur after contract execution and approvals; responders should assume a reasonable post-award mobilization period.

c. This will vary, depending on whether a subsequent Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), is issued after this RFI, when the RFP/ITN is awarded, and when a resulting agreement is executed.

Q43: Page 4 – The RFI requests a "full operational review" of the M-DCPS transportation system then notes the district is "specially interested in identifying efficiency opportunities through a rigorous evaluation of deadhead miles, fleet utilization, and on-time performance." Does this and other RFI language mean that the primary focus of this work should be looking at the district's current routing work and finding areas in need of improvement or is the scope broader? For example, poor on-time performance could be largely due to a shortage of bus drivers for the planned number of routes, which has nothing to do with the routing work.

A43: The scope is broader than routing alone and includes a full operational assessment; however, evaluating routing efficiency (e.g., deadhead miles and utilization) is a central focus alongside factors like staffing, resources, and operational constraints that impact performance.

Q44: Page 4 – By "various operational shifts," does the district mean potentially dramatic changes such as changed school start/end times, or is the focus solely on potential shifts in transportation operations? How many scenarios does the district anticipate wanting to model?

A44: The intent is to primarily evaluate transportation operational shifts rather than major policy changes like school bell times, though limited scenario modeling may be used; the district anticipates a small number of practical, high-impact scenarios.

Q45: Page 5 – The district requests a "conceptual approach" to financing of the subsequent project. Does this mean that the RFI response should include specific pricing or just the type of pricing structure (fixed-fee, etc.) typically employed to maximize district funds?

A45: The RFI response should focus on describing the proposed pricing structure and approach, rather than providing detailed or binding cost proposals at this stage.

Q46: Is one possible result of this RFI that the district will engage directly with 1+ respondents to negotiate, or will any subsequent negotiations (ITN, RFP) be open to the public, including firms that may not have responded to this RFI?

A46: Per RFI Page 4, Section 2.2, "The purpose of this Request for Information (RFI) is to gauge the level of interest and technical capabilities from vendors knowledgeable and experienced in performing full operational reviews of the District's transportation system. […] Depending on the responses and level of interest received, the District may subsequently issue a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN). Separate advertisements and notifications will be issued to the potentially interested parties at that time."

Q47: As part of this work, is the district also seeking expert consultation regarding its use of its current routing software and/or advice on potentially replacing its current routing software?

A47: The District is open to expert input regarding optimization of current routing software as well as strategic guidance on whether alternative solutions should be considered.

Q48: In developing the language for R.O.A.D.S and in responding to the board's request for a report by April 15, 2026, did the district work with a consulting firm? If so, which firm?

A48: The work supporting R.O.A.D.S. and the board-directed report was developed internally, without reliance on a third-party consulting firm.

Q49: Of the items the school board directed to be reported on by April 15, 2026 (items a through g), is the district only seeking assistance with item b? Could you provide the reports that provide the responses to the other items?

A49: While item b is the primary focus of this RFI, the district's broader effort encompasses all components identified in items a to g, including eligibility policies, workforce capacity, fleet and infrastructure, communications, data systems, and implementation requirements. Respondents may provide insights that support item b directly but also propose solutions or considerations that align with the broader framework as appropriate; supporting materials for other items will be shared through established district processes.

Q50: Would a response from the district's current routing software provider potentially be viewed more favorably than from a firm with different routing software?

A50: Per RFI Page 4, Section 2.2, "The purpose of this Request for Information (RFI) is to gauge the level of interest and technical capabilities from vendors knowledgeable and experienced in performing full operational reviews of the District's transportation system. […] Depending on the responses and level of interest received, the District may subsequently issue a formal Request for Proposals (RFP) or Invitation to Negotiate (ITN). Separate advertisements and notifications will be issued to the potentially interested parties at that time."

Q51: Approximately how many magnet students does the district have? Approximately how many do not receive transportation currently?

A51: Approximately 43,500 students, and around 30,000 magnet students use other transportation options.

Q52: Will all vendor responses to this RFI become public prior to the release of any subsequent ITN/RFP?

A52: Public Records Request are processed via the District's Citizen Information Center via the following link: https://miamidadecountyschoolsfl.nextrequest.com/. Click on "Make Request" and follow the instructions provided.