

Request for Information (RFI) Addendum

RFI: Transit Map Creation

Purpose of Addendum: Responses to Questions Received

Addendum Number: #1

Addendum Date: April 28, 2026

Point of Contact: Haley Ausserer-Zelaya, haussererzelaya@yctd.org

Responses to Questions Received

1. *How does this mapping project connect to your Short Range Transit Plan implementation and broader YoloTD goals? Specifically, please share context on ridership growth, equity, active transportation, climate commitments, and Title VI compliance.*

This project should showcase our SRTP after implementation. The SRTP aims to provide more equitable and accessible service to the Yolo County community with a Board-directed goal to increase ridership through higher service frequencies.

2. *With an eye toward completing this project in a way that exceeds expectations, how would you prioritize the following outcomes as the most important to least important: navigation clarity for riders, increased ridership, reduced call-center burden, improved equity and LEP access, or stronger alignment with regional initiatives?*

(1) Navigation clarity for riders (2) Increased ridership (3) Improved equity and LEP access (4) Stronger alignment with regional initiatives (5) Reduced call-center burden

3. *What are the most significant pain points riders are currently expressing about Yolobus information — on vehicles, at stops, and online — that you most want this project to address?*
Riders would like to see travel options laid out in a simple, clear, non-technical way—online and at stops. They want to be able to understand how far away their bus is (real-time).

4. *Are the maps envisioned by this RFI primarily as a stand-alone deliverable? Or, are they a first step towards a broader, countywide wayfinding ecosystem? As an example, encompassing stops, vehicles, digital displays, and active transportation corridors, or something else we haven't mentioned?*

These are anticipated to be relatively simple and standalone for bus routing information only.

5. *Beyond the system and route maps described in the RFI, are there priority locations — such as downtown Sacramento, UC Davis, West Sacramento, or key transfer points — where you anticipate needing special inset or neighborhood-level maps?*

Yes, we anticipate needing special inset maps for high-traffic areas, as referenced under Required Features for static service maps.

6. *How important is strict visual consistency between future bus stop signage, printed materials, and the website/system map? Is there an existing internal or regional brand system (e.g., MTC, SacRT, SACOG) that we should align to?*

Brand consistency is an important element of this project, as we seek to maintain visual alignment and recognition across Yolobus' different services. There is no regional system that needs to be aligned with.

7. *What specific communities — including but not limited to language groups, disabled, youth, seniors, underserved/marginalized, non-vehicle households, shift workers, low/lower income, or otherwise spatially displaced, etc. — should be explicitly considered or focused on in the design and usability testing of the maps?*

Disabled, seniors, youth, Spanish/Russian/Chinese language communities

8. *Do you envision the interactive system map remaining relatively simple (routes, zones, and trip planning), or eventually capable of supporting additional layers such as bike corridors, safe routes to transit, or active transportation connections?*

These are anticipated to be relatively simple and standalone for bus routing information only.

9. *If it were to evolve to add more layers, what circumstances and timing would trigger those new layers to become a part of the scope?*

N/A

10. *What is the current state of your GTFS static and GTFS-RT feeds for fixed-route, BeeLine, and Paratransit services — and who is responsible for ongoing data maintenance today?*

We do not have a GTFS feed for our Microtransit and Paratransit services. Our fixed route service has a schedule and real-time GTFS feed; both are available at <https://avl.yctd.org/RealTime/>.

11. *How is TripSpark's CAD AVL currently integrated into your operations? Do you already produce a GTFS-RT feed, or is real-time vehicle location data only available through a proprietary TripSpark API?*

TripSpark provides us with a static and real time GTFS feed available at <https://avl.yctd.org/RealTime/>.

12. *We noticed Yolobus appears to currently use the SacRT Transit Connect app. What does this mean for the scope of any mapping or real-time information tool we would develop? Is there an expectation that new tools should be embedded within or remain compatible with that app?*
Yes, Yolobus sells fares and passes on Transit Connect, along with SacRT and soon to be joined by Unitrans. This should not affect the scope of the map project, as there is no expectation that maps or real-time data should be integrated into Transit Connect.

13. *Are there regional data, technology, or branding initiatives — such as those from SACOG, Capitol Corridor, or SacRT — that Yolobus maps and digital tools should align with or connect to?*

Not at this time. Yolobus sells shared passes with SacRT, but there is no need to connect our map system with SacRT's.

14. *What is your current workflow for producing and updating both static/print maps and digital maps?*

Current workflow: staff proposes a service change, then presents it to the public followed by the Board. Once approved by the Board, final maps are put into production along with service change. Maps are made in-house using Adobe Illustrator and then the printing is contracted out to a third party.

15. *Does your team have staff experienced in design tools such as Adobe Illustrator or Canva, or is your current process primarily GIS-based (e.g., ArcGIS)?*

Our team has experience in both Canva and Adobe Illustrator, which is used for our current maps. We are also familiar with ArcGIS.

16. *After project delivery, who within your organization would be responsible for editing and updating maps to reflect schedule or route changes? What tools are they comfortable using?*

Staff in the Transit Operations and Communications departments would be responsible for editing and updating maps. Our team is comfortable with Canva, Adobe Creative Suite, WordPress, and Google Maps.

17. *Do you have existing experience with ADA-compliant mapping design for both physical and digital formats? Are there specific accessibility standards or guidelines — beyond WCAG — that we should adhere to?*

We prefer WCAG 2.2 Level AA compliance.

18. *What other internal or third-party systems would this mapping solution need to connect or integrate with (e.g., website CMS, existing trip planner, customer-facing app)?*

WordPress, Google Maps, TripSpark, RideCo, Transit app

19. *Are you interested in exploring upstream data services — such as GTFS feed creation and maintenance, timetable generation, or schedule management tooling — as part of or alongside this engagement?*

Yes, we are open to learning about a variety of solutions.

20. *Beyond a web-based map, are you expecting mobile-responsive capabilities? Should we plan for a standalone mobile-optimized experience or integration with an existing app?*

We expect mobile-responsive capabilities for the web-based map. We anticipate this would integrate into our WordPress website but are open to suggestions for other ways to handle this.

21. *Is the purpose of this RFP to build a case for an RFP? If so, what is the expected timing of that RFP in terms of months from the date of this RFI?*

The purpose of this RFI is to gather information to help us plan for a potential future RFP. There is no concrete timing for an RFP, though we anticipate releasing it within the first half of our next Fiscal Year (which begins July 1, 2026).

22. *Has a budget been approved for this project? If so, could you share any parameters or ceiling figures to help us scope our response and tiered pricing appropriately?*

A budget has not yet been approved. We hope to understand more about a typical budget scale through responses to this RFI, to help us plan more concretely.

23. *If a budget has been or is expected to be approved, on a scale of 1 to 5, where would you rank the ability to procure a configurable off-the-shelf solution for the technological parts of this RFI?*

N/A

24. *Which department within YoloTD would own and oversee this project — Planning, Operations, Communications, or another division?*

A small team of staff from Planning, Transit Operations, and Communications would oversee this project.

25. *Is this RFI part of an active process to build a business case and secure board approval for funding, or has project funding already been confirmed?*

Funding has not yet been confirmed.

26. *If funding has been confirmed, what is the expected timeline for RFP.*

See response to question 21.

27. *What community engagement or advisory bodies — such as a TAC, CAC, or Title VI outreach partners — should be involved in reviewing map designs and prototypes throughout the project?*

Our TAC and CAC may provide input during the draft phase, then review prior to approval by the Board.

28. *How do you prefer to involve your Board during the project — milestone briefings, workshops with draft designs, or formal approval checkpoints at defined deliverable stages?*
Milestone briefings and approval at checkpoints, but no workshops are necessary.

29. *Do you have existing insights from recent community or rider outreach efforts (e.g., SRTP process, YATC engagement, microtransit pilots) regarding information needs that we should treat as foundational findings?*

To visually differentiate between the different frequencies of service.

30. *Are there hard delivery dates or constraints we should assume — such as budget cycles, SRTP rollout milestones, or scheduled service changes — that would affect project timing?*

The SRTP will begin rollout in early 2027. We would like to release the maps sometime in 2027.

31. *How will you measure success one year after implementation? Potential indicators might include ridership change, website and trip planner usage, call-center volume reduction, rider survey results, or equity metrics.*

Increase in ridership and in website and trip planner usage.

32. *If you had to prioritize, would you prefer to launch a smaller, focused set of high-quality maps quickly, or invest in a phased, broader ecosystem covering stops, digital displays, and active transportation overlays over time?*

We would prefer to launch a smaller, focused set of high-quality maps quickly. At this time we are not looking at a broader wayfinding ecosystem.

33. *What are your expectations for ongoing map and data maintenance post-launch? How frequently do you anticipate needing updates to reflect schedule changes, route modifications, or service expansions?*

We do not anticipate changes to the maps for at least 2-5 years once completed.

34. *What existing tools or processes should this project integrate with?*

WordPress, Google Maps, TripSpark Streets, RideCo, Transit app

35. *After reviewing RFI responses, what decisions do you hope to make — refining scope, confirming budget, developing a shortlist for a future RFP/RFQ, or determining whether to proceed at all?*

After reviewing RFI responses, we plan to refine the scope and confirm the budget, and develop an RFP for the mapping project.

36. *Do you anticipate issuing a single RFP/RFQ covering both static design/wayfinding and digital/real-time technology, or might you split these into separate procurements?*

We are hoping to get clarity on this issue through the responses to this RFI.

37. *Is there a target timeline for any follow-on procurement — including anticipated Board approval, RFP/RFQ release date, and desired implementation start — so we can structure our phasing recommendations accordingly?*

Not at this time.

38. *Would it be helpful if we included suggested procurement structures in our RFI response — for example, a single integrated contract with distinct design and technology workstreams under a prime/sub arrangement — to simplify coordination and reduce administrative burden on your team?*

Yes.

39. *What is the specific format (e.g., shapefiles, GeoJSON) of the existing GIS data for routes, stops, and service zones that will be provided to the selected vendor?*

Stop level data can be provided in lats and longs. Existing data for routes, stops, and service zones is held by third party software provider TripSpark for fixed route and paratransit data. RideCo is the third party software provider used for microtransit service.

40. *Can YoloTD provide technical documentation, specifications, or API details for integrating the TripSpark Automatic Vehicle Locator (CAT AVL) real-time data?*

TripSpark would have to provide the documentation and allow the vendor to use its API.

41. *Is YoloTD providing or hosting the base map tiles for the Interactive Web-Based Systemwide Map, or is the vendor expected to provide a solution?*

YoloTD hosts the MyRide physical server locally and uses both Google Maps and ESRI maps. The vendor would be required to assist with the initial setup and ongoing support, while YoloTD would be responsible for maintaining the physical server.

42. *Regarding the desired feature to embed the system map on yolobus.com, are there any specific web platform, browser compatibility, or technical constraints for the existing website environment?*

Our website is on WordPress, and the interactive web-based map should be compatible with all browsers and mobile-responsive.

43. *What level of customization is required for the user interface of the interactive map, particularly concerning the search/routing feature where users "enter their start and stop points"?*

We will need customization for the user to select fixed route bus, microtransit, or paratransit service.

44. *For the required bilingual English/Spanish content, will YoloTD provide the necessary Spanish translations, or is the vendor expected to source and verify the translated content?*

YoloTD will provide the Spanish translations.

45. *Can YoloTD provide a prioritized or preliminary list of the "Selected points of interest and landmarks" that must be included on the static route maps?*

We will do this at the time the project is set to begin.

46. *Regarding the "Connections to other transit systems" (Amtrak, SacRT, etc.), what level of detail is required? Are simple notes/icons sufficient, or is a detailed map depiction of the transfer points necessary?*

Notes and icons are sufficient.

47. *For the YoloBus Special Paratransit map, is the service zone based on the current fixed routes, and if those routes change, will YoloTD require frequent updates to the paratransit service zone layer?*

The YoloBus Special Paratransit map is based on the current fixed routes. If those routes change, we will require updates to the paratransit service zone layer – we don't anticipate this will be frequent, but periodically there will be changes.

48. *What is the preferred format for the "editable versions" of the static route maps (e.g., Adobe Illustrator, InDesign, or a specific GIS native file format)?*

The preferred format is Adobe Illustrator.

49. *Does YoloTD have an existing design or brand guide that must be adhered to for the "look and feel" of the maps?*

Yes, YoloTD has a style guide that should inform the "look and feel" of the maps.

50. *Are there example maps from other transit districts in the U.S. or Internationally that you would hold up as design inspiration to achieve YoloTD's goals for this project and vendor relationship?*

We are inspired by [MARTA's](#) maps.

51. *What is the expected frequency of route or service zone changes that would necessitate map updates?*

We would not anticipate changes for at least 2-5 years once the maps are in place.

52. *For the ongoing support and updates mentioned in Question 2b of the Response Requirements, would YoloTD prefer a formal maintenance contract or a transfer of the design files with documentation for in-house updates?*

In general we prefer a transfer of the design files with documentation for in-house updates. The question is aiming to learn about the standard process and recommended options for any ongoing support needs.

53. *What budgetary guidance (i.e. a range or a cap) can Yolo county offer for either the static map or the interactive web-based map; similarly what is the expected budget range for maintenance and updates?*

We are hoping to get clarity on budget range through the responses to this RFI.

54. *Do you have a scoring system for weighting bids received, i.e. X% on Vendor Qualifications, Y% on budgetary factors?*

Not at this time. This RFI is an inquiry only. No contract or agreement will be entered into as a result of this process, nor does this RFI initiate a formal procurement or represent a commitment to issue an RFQ or an RFP in the future.

55. *[For the Static Service Maps] Can fixed route and demand response be combined into the same system map?*

Yes, for the static system map. For the individual route maps, that would be separate from demand-response which should have its own service zone map.

56. *[For the Static Service Maps] Since some routes overlap, showing all transfer points between routes could be complex and clutterful. Would you be open exploring other ways to show connections between routes?*

Yes.

57. *[For the Interactive Web-Based System Map] Some features are inherently not accessible on screen readers (e.g. map graphic and live positions of buses). We can make the input interface for route/stop exploration and trip planning accessible to WCAG AA level, but are there any other requirements for ADA compliance?*

There are no other requirements.

58. *[For the Interactive Web-Based System Map] Similarly, relevant street names will be automatically placed by the basemap and may be occasionally obscured by route lines or other elements. Is that acceptable within requirements for ADA-compliance?*

Yes.

59. *[For the Interactive Web-Based System Map] How is YoloTD envisioning embedding? iFrames will likely cause challenges for screen reader users, so you may need to provide the option to open the interactive map in a new tab.*

We are not sure how best to do this, and are hoping to gain clarity on this issue through this RFI.

60. *What is the plan for ongoing maintenance of the interactive map to reflect updated service?*

We will likely need support for maintenance and updates to the interactive map. We don't update our routes very frequently but would like to be able to have support in updating the interactive map periodically.