



February 9, 2026

Dear Proposers:

Attached is Addendum No. 3 to SEPTA's Request for Proposal No. 25-00300-AMJP - **Silverliner VI Rail Cars.**

The proposal due date and time scheduled for Friday, April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2026, at 04:30 PM remains unchanged. All proposals must be delivered to my attention by the closing date and time to be considered for the award. The proposals must be sent to SEPTA's General Offices, 1234 Market Street, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

Any inquiries regarding this proposal must be directed to Michael Piselli of the Procurement and Supply Chain Management Department at (215) 580-8364 or [mpiselli@septa.org](mailto:mpiselli@septa.org).

Thank you for your interest in the Authority.

Sincerely,

*Michael Piselli*

Michael Piselli  
Manager, Contract Administration  
Procurement & Supply Chain Management

**Request for Proposal No. 25-00300-AMJP**  
**Silverliner VI Rail Cars**  
**Addendum No. 3**

To All Bidders:

The following constitutes Addendum No. 3 to SEPTA's **25-00300-AMJP –Silverliner VI Rail Cars**. Addendum No. 3 must be acknowledged by inserting the date of the Addendum on the Addenda Response Form. Failure to do so may render a bid as non-responsive.

General:

1. Question and Answers (1-46) are attached.

February 9, 2026

ADDENDUM NO. 3

ADDENDUM ACKNOWLEDGEMENT SHEET

SEPTA's RFP No. 25-00300- AMJP  
**Silverliner VI Rail Cars.**

The attached addendum to the Contract Documents is hereby part of the same and is incorporated in full as part of the Project. Proposer shall acknowledge Addendum No. 3 by completing and returning the Addendum Acknowledgment Sheet with the Technical Proposal.

FIRM NAME: (typed or printed) \_\_\_\_\_

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME: (typed or printed) \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

Addendum No. 3 includes:

1. Question and Answers (1-46) are attached.

No.	Reference	Question	Answer
1	10.23.C	The Proposer would like to confirm the rationale for specifying that the Energy Measurement System should be integrated into the propulsion control system. Our understanding is that this requirement may be driven either by spatial limitations within the train or by the need to access data and sensors that are exclusively available inside the propulsion control system. The Proposer kindly requests confirmation as to which of these scenarios aligns with your requirements.	The intent is to access data and sensors exclusively available inside the propulsion control system.
2	26.4	CDRL 26-14 Training Aids Can SEPTA provide samples of Computer Based Training(CBT) and Interactive training video for the Proposer to gain better understanding of the scope of the work?	Suppliers such as Heartwood provide products that are similar in scope to what is being requested in the Technical Specification.
3	9.3.1.E.3	The current requirement specifies that the efficiency of all auxiliary power conversion equipment shall be greater than 90 percent under all load conditions from 10 percent to 100 percent of rated load. In practice, however, power efficiency is generally determined under rated operating conditions, as described in IEC 61287-1, Clause 4.3.4.4.3, Power Efficiency. The Auxiliary Power Supply (APS) typically receives high-voltage AC or DC input power from a main source such as a transformer or line current collector. Within the APS, components including coils (filter inductors, transformers), resistors, capacitors, and IGBTs consume power even when the load is minimal. Control circuits and cooling systems also contribute to this consumption. These elements represent fixed or idle losses that do not vary significantly with load level. At low load, such fixed losses dominate, resulting in reduced overall efficiency. Since efficiency is defined as Output Power / Input Power, when output power is low but input power (including fixed losses) remains relatively high, efficiency decreases. For this reason, it is more reasonable to measure power efficiency at 100 percent of the rated load, where the results are meaningful and consistent. Accordingly, the Proposer suggests revising the requirement as follows: "The efficiency of all auxiliary power conversion equipment shall be greater than 90 percent under 100 percent of rated load."	This requirement applies to the inverter itself, not the full connected system.
4	5.1.1.1 O 25.17.1.B.8 25.17.1.B.9	The Proposer understands that delivery of the actual mock-up is required. However, the provisions regarding the soft mock-up appear contradictory within the Technical Specification. To address this, the Proposer suggests that the soft mock-up, as stipulated in the Mock-up section, be reviewed in Carbuilder's facility and subsequently disposed of only after the full-scale A-car mock-up has been completed and SEPTA's approval has been received.	SEPTA will allow soft mock-up review at a carbuilder facility. The specification will be amended to account for this.
5	25.17.2.B.4, 5	The specification requires demonstration of A-car and B-car underfloor equipment differences during the design phase. However, incorporating actual equipment in the mock-up at FDR is difficult, especially for wiring and cables. The Proposer suggests conducting the review using a Virtual Reality (VR) representation, which allows easier verification. Confirmation is requested on whether a VR-based review may substitute for the physical mock-up.	To simplify the mock-up requirements, demonstration of underfloor equipment differences (TS 25.17.2 #B4) and Airport configuration (25.17.2 #B6) will be removed. The mock-up will be reduced to a half-car mock-up rather than a full car mock-up. Any interior passenger items that may not be present in the presented half of the car, such as bicycle racks, should be demonstrated.
6	25.17.1.B.10. f	The requirement calls for hardware, software, and licenses to allow at least two people to use VR scenarios simultaneously. In practice, one person can view via a headset while others observe on a screen, enabling collective review without multiple headsets. To streamline the process, the Proposer suggests demonstrating the VR content at CDR, PDR, and FDR instead of submitting the equipment, and requests confirmation that this approach meets the intent of the requirement.	Agreed. TS 25.17.1 #B10f will be adjusted accordingly.
7	25.15.2.5.A.1	The specification requires submission of complete and approved sets of every as-built drawing and 3D model. The Proposer suggests removing the term "3D model" from this requirement, as 3D models are treated as the company's intellectual property. The Proposer requests confirmation whether the specification can be revised to exclude 3D models while maintaining the requirement for as-built drawings.	3D model requirement will be removed from this section.
8	25.15.2.5.A.4	The specification requires that the drawing sets contain a copy of every drawing used by the Contractor, subcontractors, and suppliers in this procurement, regardless of previous submission. The Proposer suggests that drawings be submitted at the LRU (Line Replaceable Unit) level, as further detailed drawings are considered intellectual property. This approach would ensure that SEPTA receives the necessary documentation for review and approval, while protecting proprietary design details. Confirmation is requested on whether submission at the LRU level is acceptable in meeting the intent of the requirement.	SEPTA retains the requirement for drawings to the LRU level. Please see the answer to Question #17 regarding the definition of LRU. Proposer is welcome to ask a new question if the answer to this question did not resolve this concern.
9	25.15.2.5.A.5	The specification requires inclusion of circuit board level detail, installation and connection drawings, as well as general arrangement, color schedules, and clearance drawings. The Proposer suggests removing the term "circuit board level detail" from this requirement, as such drawings are considered the company's intellectual property. The Proposer requests confirmation on whether submission of the remaining drawings, without circuit board level detail, would be acceptable to meet the intent of the specification	Agreed. The specification will be adjusted accordingly.
10	26.1.7.A.4	The specification requires submission of electronic copies of each draft, Conditionally Approved, and final manual, along with printed copies of Conditionally Approved and final published manuals as outlined in Table 26-1. The Proposer suggests that, while Conditionally Approved and final published manuals will be provided in both hard copy and soft copy as specified, draft manuals be submitted in soft copy only. This approach would meet the intent of the requirement while streamlining the submittal process. Confirmation is requested on whether this proposal is acceptable	Hard copies of draft manuals will not be required except for Operator's Manual.
11	26.1.7.A.4 26.1.7.3.A/B	We propose that the hard copies of the Final Published Manual be submitted after the conclusion of the Warranty Period, ensuring that all revisions and modifications made during the Warranty Period are fully incorporated into the manual.	The Due Date of the Final Published Manuals Hard Copies will be changed to the conclusion of the warranty period for the first vehicle.
12	26.1.10.A.1	TS 26.1.10.A.1 requires the first review within 24 weeks after PDR. Since O&M Manual preparation can only begin after design freeze, The Proposer suggests conducting the first review within 4 weeks after FDR to ensure accuracy and completeness.	This requirement remains. This process does not require complete manuals for review, note TS 26.1.10 #3B.
13	15.4.9 16.20.1	Sections 15.4.9 and 16.20.1 both specify Floor Assembly Fire Resistance Test requirements. However, there is a conflict between the two section requirements. Which content should we comply with?	TS 15.4.9 requirements apply. TS 16.20.1 will be amended to align with TS 15.4.9.
14	1.4.A.3 13.16 17.4.3 24.4.1.2.A	Source code delivery is required (by TS 13.16, TS 17.4.3, TS 24.4.1.2.A.) and TS is comprehended that the software works including source code that can be placed in escrow (by TS 1.4.A. 3.) Please clarify the escrow details. - Selection of escrow agent - Escrow period and milestone - Escrow verification activity approval process	Source code delivery is not required under this contract. The specification will be updated to remove source code references. For any other contractual requirements related to escrow: 1. NCC (formerly Iron Mountain) shall be the escrow agent. 2. The initial escrow period shall be 10 years paid for by the carbuilder. SEPTA shall pay for any additional renewals. 3. SEPTA understands the verification question may be related to source code. Escrow verification activity/approval is only required to verify the contents of any escrowed material.
15	1.11	As for the Schedule Speed: The average speed of a car, from terminal to terminal, obtained by dividing the distance between these points by the time taken to make the trip, including time for intermediate station stops. Can SEPTA provide a definition of the 'average speed' in the above context?	In this context average speed = Total distance traveled divided by the duration of trip.

16	21.3.1.A.2	SEPTA-furnished equipment may be considered for exclusion from the scope of the Reliability Prediction, since it falls outside the Manufacturer's (Supplier's) supply and design control. Reliability Prediction is intended to serve as the basis for activities through which the manufacturer can improve reliability during the design and component selection phases. Because the manufacturer has no authority over SEPTA-furnished equipment—meaning its design cannot be modified and alternative components cannot be selected—the prediction results cannot be used to enhance its reliability. In this context, the Proposer would like to suggest that SEPTA-furnished equipment be excluded from the prediction scope, with responsibility for its reliability remaining with SEPTA or the original equipment manufacturer. We kindly request confirmation on whether this suggested approach is acceptable.	Agreed, the specification will be adjusted to remove this reference. Note: that this does not exempt carbuilder supplied equipment interfacing with SEPTA-furnished equipment. Also note: the carbuilder will still be required to monitor reliability for SEPTA-furnished equipment, if any.
17		The Proposer requests that the Reliability Prediction be performed primarily at the LRU (Line Replaceable Unit) level rather than the LLRU (Lowest Line Replaceable Unit) level. The LRU is the standard basis for Reliability Prediction for practical reasons, since actual field maintenance is carried out by replacing the entire LRU unit. Even if a report provides failure rates at the LLRU level, analyzing at the LRU level is more effective and ensures better consistency when performing system-level impact analyses such as Fault Tree Analysis (FTA). For example, analysis should be conducted at the CPU Board unit (LRU) level rather than extending unnecessarily down to the component level (LLRU) on the board. The Proposer therefore recommends that Reliability Prediction be performed fundamentally at the LRU level, with analysis extending to the LLRU level only if specifically required during the analysis process, and seeks confirmation that this approach is acceptable.	The proposer's understanding of the definition of LLRU in the TS appears to be incorrect. A component on a circuit board would not be an LLRU according to TS 1 definitions. Please resubmit this question if this clarification did not satisfy the concern.
18	21.3.C	The Proposer seeks confirmation regarding the definitions applied to the MDBF-ALL (Mean Distance Between Failures – All) calculation timeline and the Availability Target values, as referenced in the TS requirements. As for MDBF Timeline Definitions, please confirm whether the following interpretations are correct: 1. Does the term “6 months after” mean “six months after 10% of base order cars have entered the reliability demonstration period”? 2. Does the term “12 months after” mean “one year after 10% of base order cars have entered the reliability demonstration period”? As for the availability target calculation Assuming the base Availability Target is 90%, please confirm whether the calculation of the required achievement percentages is interpreted correctly as follows: - 60% of requirement: 54% (60% × 90% Availability Target) - 70% of requirement: 63% (70% × 90% Availability Target) - 90% of requirement: 81% (90% × 90% Availability Target) The Proposer kindly requests confirmation of the correct definitions and calculation methodology to ensure alignment with SEPTA's expectations.	1. Yes 2. Yes 3. The interpretation of the availability target is correct.
19	23.1.3.A.2	Our Safety Program Plan requires compliance with MIL-STD-882C in accordance with the corresponding TS requirements. However, other requirements within the TS reference compliance with MIL-STD-882 without clearly specifying the version number. We would therefore like to confirm whether MIL-STD-882C should be applied as the governing standard for SEPTA Silverliner VI program.	For consistency, the reference to MIL-STD-882C will be changed to MIL-STD-882.
20	1.11	Regarding the 6-Minute Delay Criterion in the definition of “Delay, Train”, we request clarification on its interpretation. Does the “6-minute delay” refer to: a. A cumulative delay of six minutes accrued by the train until it reaches the next scheduled stop (i.e., the immediate station following the failure), or b. A cumulative delay of six minutes accrued by the train until it reaches the final terminal station, based on the overall operating diagram (DIA)? Please confirm which interpretation is correct	Interpretation "A" is correct, a train is considered delayed if it is greater than 6 minutes late for a scheduled station stop.
21	1.11	Please confirm whether the following changeover scenario is acceptable as a “Delay, Train” event for MDBD calculation purposes. Defined Scenario – Changeover: A condition in which the train completes its currently assigned Diagram (DIA) trip but is subsequently replaced by a different train for the next scheduled DIA departure. We kindly request confirmation on whether this specific changeover state should be considered a “Delay, Train” event that must be recorded and included in the MDBD calculation.	Yes, this scenario should be considered a delay.
22	23.4.2.A 23.5	The Proposer have identified a discrepancy regarding the submission timing of the Safety and Security Certification Report. According to the specific requirement, the submission point is defined as: “fleet prior to delivering it to SEPTA, prior to the end of the warranty period for the Pilot Cars, and prior to the fleet being placed in revenue service.” However, the CDRL description in TS 23.5 states that this document must be submitted “30 days prior to FDR (Final Design Review).” These two submission timelines are contradictory. Given that the Safety and Security Certification Report includes verification of safety requirements, the submission timing defined in TS 23.4.2.A is considered more appropriate. The Proposer kindly requests confirmation of the correct and definitive submission timing for this document.	The CDRL 23-15 description indicates the first submission related to these activities while TS 23.4.2 describes time periods where updates are required.
23	23.4.1.A.3	The requirements for the composition of the Safety and Security Certification Committee (SSCC) specify the inclusion of both a ‘Safety Program Manager’ and a ‘Security Program Manager.’ Please confirm whether a single individual may fulfill both roles and serve as the ‘Safety & Security Program Manager’ for the SSCC.	Confirmed, provided this individual is qualified to perform both roles.
24	25.20 CDRL 25-15	Spare Parts Control Numbering System is required to comply with SEPTA's VMIS. Could SEPTA provide the specific SEPTA's VMIS requirements related to the Spare Parts Control Numbering system?	Spare parts must be associated with a SEPTA class and lot number to be provided by SEPTA. See TS 26.1.6.5 #A1. Details of the class and lot (stock) numbering system to be provided during design review.

25	2.4.2	<p>TS 2.4.2 requires an ambient temperature condition of -15°F to 120°F (-26°C to 49°C). However, for the battery system to withstand these extreme temperatures while still meeting the required performance, it would need to be significantly larger in both electrical capacity and physical size.</p> <p>In accordance with IEEE 1568 Recommended Practice for Electrical Sizing of Nickel-Cadmium Batteries for Rail Passenger Vehicles, which states:  <i>“Although the battery may be required to operate over a wider temperature range, it is sufficiently prudent to calculate the vehicle battery capacity based on the Normal Daily Maximum and Normal Daily Minimum values of temperature for the warmest and the coldest month of the year respectively, not on the Extreme Record High and Extreme Record Low Values.</i></p> <p><i>NOTE – The Normal Daily Maximum and Normal Daily Minimum for each month is the average over 30 years of the highest or lowest temperature respectively in that month.”</i></p> <p>According to our survey, the average temperature range for Philadelphia over the past 30 years is -3.3°C to 31.2°C.</p> <p>Therefore, we propose adopting an ambient temperature condition of 14°F to 104°F (-10°C to 40°C) for evaluating battery capacity.</p>	The proposal is acceptable for battery sizing purposes, the TS will be modified to incorporate this. Note that the 90 minute requirement for FRA regulated loads still apply under all operating conditions.
26	9.7.1.G	<p>Due to the low operating voltage, the Proposer is constrained in scaling up the battery capacity. This challenge is further exacerbated by the maximum capacity limitations of potential battery sub-suppliers. Accordingly, a one-hour (60-minute) operating duration is recommended as the appropriate design baseline.</p>	The 90-minute requirement must remain due to FRA regulation. If proposer seeks relief to other non-FRA regulated loads, please ask a question to that effect.
27	10.1 Propulsion	<p>In reference to the 'TS 10.1.1.A' requirement, we respectfully request that the technical specifications be revised to broaden the definition of "service proven" beyond North America. Such an adjustment would enable SEPTA to accept more competitive proposals for the propulsion system. The Proposer wish to emphasize that even with the suggested changes, it is intended to manufacture the propulsion system in the US to ensure full compliance with Buy America regulations.</p> <p>A. The propulsion system traction motors and converter design shall be service proven in North America commuter railroad service of comparable demand and severity.      &lt;Suggested Change&gt;</p> <p>A. The propulsion system traction motors and converter design shall be service proven in commuter or regional railroad service under suitable operating conditions.</p>	The requirement will be reworded as follows: "The propulsion system traction motors and converter design shall be <b>a</b> service proven design in North American commuter railroad service <b>appropriately sized to meet the performance, towing, and duty cycle requirements of the Specifications.</b> <del>of comparable demand and severity."</del>
28	7.2.2	<p>Clarification is requested on whether the CFD scope (CDRL 07-06) extends beyond ventilation and temperature stratification to include outside door cycling and cabin pressurization. Please also identify any other specific design conditions required for simulation.</p>	CFD does not extend beyond the ventilation and temperature stratification requirements as specified. There are no other specific design constraints required beyond what is specified.
29	5.1.1.1 C 6.2.1 A. 2 6.2.1 H	<p>5.1.1.1 Layout          C. The operating cab shall be a full-width design. If a low level boarding door at the Fend is provided, a trap door shall fully cover the stairwell.</p> <p>6.2.1 General          2. The side passenger doors for low-level boarding shall be located either at the end of each car, with only one side door at the Cab end (F-end), or at approximate quarter points inward of the trucks, adjacent to the high level doors.</p> <p>H. A trap door shall be provided to cover the steps only on the low-level boarding door located on the opposite side of the Cab. The trap door is intended to be lowered only when the cab is occupied in order to provide a level full-width cab space to the operator.</p> <p>Question) Low-floor door sections without trapdoors leave the stairwell permanently exposed to passengers inside the car. If a low-level door is installed adjacent to a high-level door, a trapdoor appears to be necessary for passenger safety. Please confirm whether the omission of trapdoors is standard practice for center-mounted low-level door configurations</p>	A trap door shall not be installed unless the low-level door is within the cab area. Any safety concerns shall be addressed during safety analysis in design review.
30	3.4.1.2 A	<p>3. The retrofit shall minimize the gap between the closed door and the <u>new floor</u> to the greatest extent practical and shall be Approved.</p> <p>Question) Can the trap door system be implemented as the new flooring for high-level boarding conversion, or does the client require flooring similar to the passenger compartment for a permanent modification?</p>	The modification provisions shall include flooring similar to the passenger compartment for a permanent modification.
31	14.5.2	<p>A. Provide bicycle stowing racks:          1. Type, locations, and overall size of bicycle storage rack shall be approved during Design Review.</p> <p>Question) Please clarify how many bickcle racks shall be provided in each car and the bike can be storead at the multiuse area?</p>	One bicycle rack per car shall be provided. The bicycle racks shall be capable of storing 2 bicycles each. The bicycle rack can be stored in the multiuse area but cannot be stored in the ADA seating area. Specification to be updated to add this clarification.
32	15.7.5.2	<p>Heat Transfer: UA Factor Determination          A          1. Perform the test at an ambient temperature between -20°F and 25°F (-29°C and -4°C) with the evaporator blowers shut down and all external grilles blocked. Internal heating shall be supplied by the car heated floor (if applicable) and sidewall heaters. No additional space heaters shall be applied.</p> <p>Question) If additional heaters (e.g., heated floor under the seats) are installed in the vehicle, please confirm whether they can be activated concurrently during the heat transfer test</p>	Confirmed.
33	2.2.1 14.4.2	<p>Vehicle Dimensions          A. Center aisle minimum width, 3+2 seating area : 1 ft. 9 in. (21 in)</p> <p>Seating Configuration          G. All main seating area transverse seats shall follow the aisle and seat width minimums to provide an aisle of 32 inches (812.8 mm) where there is 2x2 seating and an aisle of 21.5 inches (546.1 mm) where there is 3x2 seating.</p> <p>Question) The carbody width and interior minimum widths match the Silverliner V specifications, but the center aisle has been increased in TS 14.4.2.G.          Please clarify whether the 1 foot 9 inch dimension is correct.</p>	Confirmed.
34	20.1.B	<p>Please provide "the Ansaldo PTC System Functional Description document number S820661-01300-2100 latest revision". as the proponent shall be aware of its system in order to suubmit a proposall and collaborate with the designated sytem supplier.</p>	To be provided after NTP.
35	5.2.9.1.C	<p>The phrase 'furnished by the propulsion supplier' is understood to mean that the supplier is responsible for providing the equipment, but is not strictly required to manufacture it in-house. We believe it is acceptable to source the master controller and key switch from a specialized third-party company, provided that they are fully compatible and work perfectly with the propulsion system. Please confirm if our understanding is correct.</p>	Confirmed.

36	2.2.1	<p>A. Distance between carbody jacking pads (two sets of pads) 61 ft. 7.88 in. 57 ft. 4.12 in.</p> <p>Question) If there are any jacking pads under the driver's cab area, these jacking pads could interfere with the installation of low-platform door in the cab area. If low-platform doors are to be applied to the cab area, we would like to inquire if the jacking pads can be removed, considering SEPTA's maintenance facilities.</p>	<p>Compatibility with shop permanent jacking systems must be maintained. The emergency jacking location as shown in Appendix II does not need to be the same in the Silverliner VI design but an emergency jacking location must be provided per TS 3.3.7.1 #A3.</p>
37	6.2.1 14.1.10.1	<p>6.2.1. A. 2. The side passenger doors for low-level boarding shall be located either at the end of each car, with only one side door at the Cab end (F-end), or at approximate quarter points inward of the trucks, adjacent to the high level doors.</p> <p>2. The other door type is for low level platforms and shall have stairs built into the car for passengers to get from the low level of the platform into the car (and vice versa for egress) without the use of steps or ramps.</p> <p>Question 1) In order to comply with the static outline conditions and the horizontal/vertical gap standards required by the ADA, the installation of an onboard ramp is necessary. We would like to inquire whether the same type of ramp applied to the Silverliner 5, not portable ramp, can be used.</p> <p>Question 2) If low-platform doors are installed at the ends of each car, should the door leaf cover the stepwell area when closed, or is it acceptable for the stepwell to remain visible from the exterior?</p>	<p>1. An onboard ramp shall not be provided whether portable or permanent. SEPTA believes the bridge plates located on the platforms can meet ADA requirements for this vehicle. Further discussion can occur during design review.</p> <p>2. The door leaf should cover the stepwell area when closed.</p>
38	10.23.D	<p>10.23.D Except as otherwise required in these specifications, energy measurement shall comply with the requirements as detailed in the relevant parts of EN 50463, EN 50591 and relevant standards referenced therein to permit verification of energy consumption.</p> <p>- Since the 25Hz catenary frequency is outside the scope of EN 50463, full compliance is technically restricted. We propose an alternative proven method: each power unit (Traction and APS) measures its own energy consumption, which is then integrated and displayed by the MDS (Monitoring and Diagnostics System). Please advise if this approach is acceptable for monitoring energy consumption.</p>	<p>The requirements of TS 10.23 #B remain. The proposed alternate solution of each power unit measuring its own consumption would not fulfill TS 10.23 #B. The carbuilder may propose an alternate standard or a modified version of EN 50463 for SEPTA's approval to fulfill the requirements of TS 10.23.</p>
39	3.4.1.2. A2 - High-level Boarding Conversion Kit	<p>The conversion process shall be designed without the need for any alterations or adjustments within the door system's existing structure, mechanisms, or functionality.</p> <p><b>Please confirm or clarify: There is no desire to replace the low-level door panel to a high-level door panel, and there is no desire to replace any other related door components, such as the threshold and seals. The conversion solution would be fitted around these components.</b></p>	<p>Confirmed however note the gap minimization requirement in TS 3.4.1.2 #A3.</p>
40	5.1.3 i - Cab Enclosure	<p>If offered, the left side of the cab shall include a low level door panel, stairwell, and doorway for passenger ingress and egress</p> <p><b>Would this be an additional doorway per car, for a total of 9 side doorways per car? Or is one of the requested doorways modified such that it has a trap door?</b></p>	<p>This requirement applies if a low-level door is installed in the cab area. This is not a requirement for an extra door beyond what is specified.</p>
41	10.14.1.A.4 - Pantograph - General	<p>With the exception of the carbon strip, the pantograph shall be capable of operating for <del>10</del> 7 years <b>without overhaul with efforts after test validation to evaluate the extension of major component overhaul to 10 years</b>, under the operating conditions listed in Section 2, Design and Performance Criteria.</p> <p><b>Requesting modification of the language as shown. The modification of this language will allow for more competitive solutions to be considered acceptable by SEPTA without significantly impacting availability or downtime.</b></p>	<p>Accepted. The specification will be modified accordingly.</p>
42	4.3.3.3 - Contacts	<p>A. Contacts shall be individually spring loaded to provide positive pressure against opposing coupler contacts. The contact spring shall be stainless steel and isolated from the current conduction path. <b>Alternate contact type may be proposed for approval.</b></p> <p>F. Contact tips shall be replaceable from the front face of the coupler and shall be secured to prevent loosening by a suitable means. <b>Alternate contact type may be proposed for approval.</b></p> <p>H. Alternate contact types from button style for specific functions, such as network connections, may be proposed for approval. <b>This allows alternate contact types to be considered allowable for network and trainline contacts. The modification of this language will allow for more competitive solutions to be considered acceptable by SEPTA.</b></p>	<p>Accepted. The specification will be modified accordingly.</p>
43	3.3.1 C	<p>According to Section 3.3.1 C of the Technical Specifications, the applicable anti-climbing requirements specified in 49 CFR 238.205 shall apply.</p> <p>Pursuant to 49 CFR 238.205 (up to date as of 8/31/2023), all passenger equipment placed in service for the first time on or after March 9, 2010, shall have anti-climbing mechanism capable of resisting an upward or downward vertical force of 100,000 pounds <b>without permanent deformation</b>.</p> <p>Regarding these requirements, we have the following inquiries:</p> <p>1. Request for Criteria Modification: Given that the WABTEC couplers used on SEPTA V were approved based on the "without failure" (ultimate strength) criterion, would it be permissible to change the current requirement from "without permanent deformation" (yield strength) to "without failure" (ultimate strength)?</p> <p>2. Permissibility of Local Yielding: If the "without failure" criterion is mandated, would local yielding be acceptable under the specified vertical load?</p>	<p>Denied. CFR compliance must be maintained.</p>
44	12.9.1 A	<p>Section 12.9.1 A states that Each married pair shall be equipped with a complete air compressor system, including air compressor, filters, air dryers, controls, and all needed accessories, mounted on a unitized subframe arranged for ease of replacement on the car. Please clarify one of complete air compressor system shall be provided per each married pair, which means one of complete air compressor system is provided either A car or B car.</p>	<p>Confirmed.</p>
45	N/A	<p>There is no requirement for the sanding system in Technical Specification. However, considering the operating conditions seasonally such as dew, frost and leaf oil accumulation, the sanding system would be needed to increase the available adhesion. Please clarify the sanding system shall be provided or not.</p>	<p>A sanding system shall not be provided. SEPTA believes the specification can be met without the use of sanding systems.</p>

46	15.4.7.1.A	<p>1. An IEC 60349-2 type test shall be performed by the manufacturer on the first production motor, one additional motor selected at random, and then one for every 50 motors, selected by SEPTA.</p> <p>- Considering that IEC 60349-2 states that repeated full type test is not required when there are no changes in electromagnetic design, manufacturing place and/or method, we are concerned that re-testing every 50 units may result in unnecessary test costs and production delays. Therefore We would like to inquire whether it would be acceptable to revise the specification to perform the type test every 100 motors.</p>	Accepted. The specification will be modified accordingly.
----	------------	---	---