



## MAINE TURNPIKE AUTHORITY

### ADDENDUM NO. 1

#### REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

#### CONSULTANT CONTRACT 2024.108

#### AUTOMATIC LICENSE PLATE RECOGNITION (ALPR) SOLUTION

The following represents questions received as of 4:00 p.m. January 31, 2025 along with the Authority's responses.

1. Question: Regarding the Pricing Instructions, will you be providing the pricing sheet template or do you expect that we will provide our own pricing sheet excel file?

**Answer: The pricing sheet template, in excel, has been reissued as Appendix 1 as part of this Addendum 1.**

2. Question: The RFQ Notice to Vendors, Section III Statement of Qualification Preparation, page 3 states that "To facilitate the evaluation, the Proposer is requested to organize its Statement of Qualification to coincide with the sequence of Items 1 through 9 below", however, the requirements end with Item 8- Appendices. Is this a typo or is there an Item 9 missing?

**Answer: In Section III, the second sentence has been changed in its entirety to the following: "To facilitate the evaluation, the Proposer is requested to organize its Statement of Qualification to coincide with the sequence of Items 1 through 8 below."**

3. Question: For Section III Statement of Qualification Preparation, Item 6 Pricing, page 5, is the detailed cost breakdown template included as part of the 10-page limit?

**Answer: No.**



4. Question: To reduce costs, does the Authority require the level of documentation outlined in the Scope of Work, Section 2.6, for the service the vendor is expected to provide? Since the scope of work already mandates that the ALPR provider meet the contractual performance requirements, why are such detailed documents essential?

**Answer: Yes, this documentation is required. The level of documentation specified in the RFP is required as the Maine Turnpike Authority will be responsible for the majority of the maintenance and administration of the ALPR solution.**

5. Question: Is a Disaster Recovery solution required for ALPR system?

**Answer: A Disaster Recovery solution is not required however the Proposer shall include in their proposal a description of any necessary components, licenses, processes, etc. that would be required if a back-up solution was needed by the Authority. In addition, the Proposer is welcome to include in their response any features, functions, or services that they may offer that could assist the MTA should a DR solution be required in the future.**

6. Question: Will the Authority provide network and VPN connectivity to ALPR system?

**Answer: At this time remote connectivity to the ALPR solution is not planned. However, the Proposer shall include in their response any advantages of allowing connectivity to the ALPR system and any disadvantages of not allowing this access.**

7. Question: Does Authority have security/compliance requirements for ALPR data?

**Answer: The ALPR data will not contain any Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and therefore the Authority is not requiring specific security/compliance requirements for ALPR data. However, it is required that the Vendor to whom this contract is awarded will maintain confidentiality of all system data.**

8. Question: Does Authority have backup or archiving requirements ALPR data?

**Answer: No. The Authority will be responsible for all back-up and archiving of ALPR data.**

9. Question: Will the Authority extend the statements due date by one week to allow additional time from Authority question responses to statements submittal?

**Answer: Proposers will be allowed additional time to submit responses. Statements of qualifications are due no later than, 4:00 p.m., prevailing time as determined by the Authority on February 14, 2025.**



10. Question: Does the MTA need a file-based ALPR lookup or WebAPI-based ALPR Lookup?

**Answer: The MTA is currently using file-based exchanges and does not require WebAPI based ALPR lookups. However if an WebAPI based ALPR lookup is available as part of the Vendor's solution it should be addressed as an Optional feature and a description provided as to how this feature could be integrated at a later date.**

11. Question : Will MTA provide truthed samples of Vertically, Horizontally and Diagonally stacked plates?

**Answer: The MTA will provide a representative sample of plates typically seen on the Maine Turnpike and samples of Vertically, Horizontally and Diagonally stacked plates will be included as part of the file sent per RFQ Section IV, in order to support the demonstration.**

12. Question: For SOW #13 feedback on truthed images, will it contain images with obstructed plates (as defined in SOW #18 ) to be used for the final performance calculations?

**Answer: The intent of SOW #13 is to allow MTA to provide truthed examples of good images that have been passed to the MIR. If the Proposer has a process that can benefit from feedback on all MIR-processed images, please expand upon this in your proposal response.**

13. Question: For SOW #13 Feedback, is it for all images that have gone through the ALPR process or a subset of the images that went through the ALPR process? We prefer full feedback to improve the ALPR process.

**Answer: Please refer to question #12**

14. Question: Will MTA provide additional verified images for initial testing?

**Answer: The MTA will work collaboratively with the Vendor after award, such as providing truthed image files, however it is incumbent upon the vendor to perform their own truthing necessary to properly validate and test the ALPR solution and to ensure contract requirements are met.**

15. Question: Will MTA provide additional truthed and unverified images for formal system testing?

**Answer: Please refer to question #14**



16. Question: “For SOW #24, Is the Performance testing period 1 day/week/month?”

**Answer: It is expected that the Proposer, as part of their response to the RFQ, would propose the timeline necessary in order to prove the system is performing in compliance with RFQ performance specifications, prior to the solution being released to production. The intent of performance testing is to ensure the solution has had the opportunity to process a thoroughly representative population of plates typically seen on Authority facilities in all types of lighting and other conditions. The Authority anticipates that the performance review period would be no longer than 90 days.**

17. Question: Could the Turnpike provide details as to the quality of the image transactions transmitted from the lane? Specifically: *[(please note the following questions a - g pertain to this general question # 17)]*

18. (a) What camera(s) models generate these images?

**Answer: Please refer to RFQ Section VI. 2. The Authority utilizes a variety of cameras (FLIR, LARA, and Luminera video cameras). The Authority is regularly upgrading its equipment as new technology becomes available and as such the cameras used by the Authority may change during the term of the Contract. The Proposer shall indicate in their proposal any challenges to, or limitations of their ALPR solution with respect to camera makes or models.**

19. (b) What is the camera(s) raw image size output?

**Answer: Images are JPEG and are compressed when received at the Authority's back-office from the lane vendor. The images received are color and approximately 100 Kilobytes per image. The Proposer shall include in their proposal any challenges to, or limitations of their solution based on image size.**

20. (c) Is the lane image Region of Interest (ROI) already generated at the lane or is the full image sent?

**Answer: This is produced at the toll point and can be part of the file sent by the Authority to the ALPR solution, along with the full image.**



21. (d) When transmitted, are the images downsized? If so, by how much?

**Answer: Please refer to question #19**

22. (e) When transmitted, are the images compressed? Is so, by what JPG factor or other factor?

**Answer: Please refer to question #19**

23. (f) When transmitted, what are the image intensity count differences between plate character pixel values and plate background pixel values? (Note this is typically a count-difference-to-peak-to-peak-noise ratio measurement of X or higher).

**Answer: This information is not readily available to the Authority. The Proposer in their proposal shall describe any challenges to, or limitations of their solution regarding image intensity/count.**

24. (g) When transmitted, what is the pixel count for the license plate registration characters per horizontal and vertical stroke-width of the characters on the plate? (Note typically measured as X pixels per plate-character stroke-width

**Answer: This information is not readily available to the Authority. The Proposer in their proposal shall describe any challenges to, or limitations of their solution regarding pixel count.**

25. Question: Could the Turnpike provide a sample contract with terms and conditions?

**Answer: A sample Contract has been provided as part of Addendum 1.**

26. Question: 2.2. Performance Requirements, # 21; Business rules for license plate reading, at times, can affect how transactions are processed and their performance calculations. Could the Authority have any business rules for processing image-based transactions expected to be implemented in this ALPR solution?

**Answer: In general, it is not the Authority's intention to filter captured images prior to sending transactions to the ALPR solution. In the Proposer's response to this RFQ the Proposer shall describe any business rules that may negatively impact their solution's performance. The Proposer in their response to the RFQ should also describe their approach to achieving the highest performance of the ALPR Solution, including,**



**computations for quantity, quality, confidence, and yield through automation. This should include details of the computations for the confidence and yield definition, sources of numerator and denominator, etc..**

27. Question: When and how will responses to questions be published

**Answer: All questions received by the Authority on or before the question deadline date have been answered as part of Addendum 1. Answers will be posted on the Authority's website @: <https://www.maineturnpike.com/Business-With-MTA/Engineering-Consultants/Current-RFQ-RFP/Automatic-License-Plate-Recognition.aspx>**

28. 2.1. -9 States the "The ALPR Solution shall extract and articulate Plate Data, including issuing jurisdiction, plate numbers/letters, special characters, and plate type, and any other features that will allow for differentiation of one plate/vehicle from another in an automated manner such as a digital fingerprint." *[(please note the following questions a - k pertain to this general question # 28)]*

29. (a) What is the source where the ALPR Solution shall extract from? Are these existing cameras?

**Answer: Please refer to questions #18 through #24**

30. (b) What are the technical specifications of the cameras (MP, frames per second, etc.)?

**Answer: Please refer to questions #18 through #24**

31. (c) What is the distance from the camera to the plate

**Answer: Please refer to questions #18 through #24**

32. (d) What is the typical speed of vehicles

**Answer: The speed of the vehicles vary based on toll points. The range is from 'stop & go' (for cash payment customers) to routine highway speeds which can be in excess of 70 MPH (ORT toll points). The toll system has been tested successfully to capture useable images of vehicles traveling at 100 mph.**



33. (e) Can we get sample images / video?

**Answer: Sample images will be available per RFQ Section IV - Demonstration.**

34. (f) What are the quantities of cameras?

**Answer: Please refer to question #18**

35. (g) What are the locations of the cameras

**Answer: The Authority does not believe this information is necessary for Proposers to provide a response to the RFQ. Locations of the toll points can be found by viewing Google Earth or other aerial images of the Turnpike.**

36. (h) GPS locations

**Answer: Please refer to question #35**

37. (i) Mounting locations - over the roadway or on the side of the roadway

**Answer: For ORT locations cameras are mounted overhead. For other locations cameras are mounted to the side of the toll lane, in the front and rear.**

38. (j) Over the roadway - height of cameras

**Answer: This varies depending on location and ranges from 17 feet to 20 feet.**

39. (k) Side of roadway – height of cameras and angle to read area

**Answer: This varies depending on location and ranges from four to eight feet.**

40. Since cloud-based solutions offer greater security and manageability and represent potential cost-savings, would the Authority consider working with a cloud-based solution for their project or please confirm that only on-premise solutions will be reviewed and ultimately awarded?

**Answer: Please refer to the RFQ; the Authority is seeking a solution that is completely on the premises of the Authority (not cloud-based).**



41. Per Page 7, VI., 1., Vendor’s proposed solutions must ‘integrate with the Authority’s BOS.’  
Can the Authority elaborate on this requirement?

**Answer: Please refer to the RFQ Technical background and SOW for necessary details regarding the current back-office system and expected interface.**

42. Given the strict 20-page limit for responses, are Vendors anticipated to respond to each line item of the Scope of Work in detail?

**Answer: Proposals shall be efficient and direct to the point with no superfluous information. Further, while the Proposer is not required to address each requirement individually, the Proposer's response should describe how their solution will meet or exceed the Authority's expectations and the stated system performance.**

43. Will the Authority allow for electronic or email submissions in lieu of hard copies?

**Answer: No, as per the RFQ, the Authority requires that Vendors shall submit five (5) printed copies and one electronic copy in PDF of the complete Statement of Qualification.**

44. Please confirm if it is a typo in the statement on Page 3 of 2024.108 - MTA ALPR RFQ .pdf: “To facilitate the evaluation, the Proposer is requested to organize its Statement of Qualification to coincide with the sequence of Items 1 through 9 below,” since there are only 8 items.

**Answer: Please refer to question #2.**

45. Will MTA share an Excel template for the pricing file as referenced in 2024.108 - MTA ALPR RFQ - Appendix 1 Pricing Sheet.pdf?

**Answer: Please refer to question #1.**

46. Is it okay to assume that the number of transactions per month is between 750,000-1,125,000?

**Answer: The total number of vehicle transactions, including cash, E-ZPass, and Image-based transactions ranges from 5.8 million per month to over 10 million per month. The number of image-based transactions ranges from roughly 15% to 25% of total transactions. Please reference Section VI. #2 for additional background.**





47. Are there any additional details available regarding the insurance requirements for this contract?

**Answer: There are no additional insurance requirements as long as the Vendor staff is not working on MTA property.**

48. Would the authority allow the selected contractor to have access to the server in a controlled manner so that they can understand how they are performing and be able to continuously improve?

**Answer: The Authority will work collaboratively with the Vendor after award to ensure there is adequate data available to allow the Vendor to evaluate ALPR and Vendor performance.**

49. Considering the current timeline, with the due date for submitting questions scheduled for January 31 and the final proposal submission deadline on February 7th, we would like to kindly request an extension of the submission deadline by two weeks. This additional time would allow us to thoroughly review the responses to the submitted questions, address any clarifications, and adapt our proposal accordingly to ensure a comprehensive and well-aligned response.

**Answer: Please refer to question #9**

50. How frequent will audits occur? Will these audits be handled by the Authority?

**Answer: The Authority will perform audits on a frequent but unscheduled basis. The Vendor is encouraged to perform their own audits as well as part of their quality control and assurance practices.**

51. How long does the authority expect the contractor to retain the data?

**Answer: Please refer to question #8**

52. Do we have to store the image data, or can we reference the Authority's copy of the data?

**Answer: Please refer to question #8**

Michael J. Cianchette, Falmouth, Chairman  
Jane L. Lincoln, Farmingdale, Vice-Chair  
Nina A. Fisher, Farmingdale  
Andrew J. McLean, Gorham  
Thomas J. Zuke, Saco  
Bruce A. Van Note, MaineDOT Ex-Officio



Peter S. Merfeld, P.E., Interim Executive Director  
John P. Sirois, Chief Financial Officer & Treasurer  
Jonathan A. Arey, Secretary & General Counsel

All Proposers are required to acknowledge the receipt of the Addendum No. 1 for Consultant Contract 2024.108 - Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Solution signing below and emailing this sheet to Nate Carll, at [ncarll@maineturnpike.com](mailto:ncarll@maineturnpike.com).

---

Business Name

---

Print Name and Title

---

Signature

---

Date

Thank You,  
Nate Carll  
Purchasing Manager  
Maine Turnpike Authority  
2360 Congress Street  
Portland, Maine 04102  
207-482-8115  
[ncarll@maineturnpike.co](mailto:ncarll@maineturnpike.co)