

CITY OF NEWTON, MASSACHUSETTS
PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
purchasing@newtonma.gov
Fax (617) 796-1227

March 30, 2023

ADDENDUM #1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #23-78

PARKING VIOLATION PROCESS AND COLLECTION SERVICES

THIS ADDENDUM IS TO: ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

Q1. Quite honestly the RFP looks like it's written for one particular vendor, and is in fact being "steered" to that one particular vendor.Not sure why there's even bid, just sole source what is obviously being requested, from the vendor that is obviously being described.

A1. The RFP is not being "steered" to any particular vendor.

Q2. As vendors may have questions that depend on answers from the City to determine if they can respond to the RFP or not, would the City be able to answer questions as soon as possible or this week? As it takes 3 days to ship a physical bid response, if answers are not provided by April 3rd vendors may not be able to respond.

A2. Answers to vendor questions will be answered as soon as possible.

Q3. It is understood the City has a deadline it needs to meet. However, a proposal of this complexity requires a significant amount of effort to provide a high-quality and thorough response. Would the City be open to extending the response deadline?

A3. Yes, the City will extend the deadline for the submission of proposals to April 20, 2023 at 12:00 noon. The question deadline will also be extended to Friday, April 7, 2023 at 12:00 noon.

Q4. As the City is looking to launch on July 1st, 2023, can the City provide a definite answer on when an award will be posted?

A4. The City will determine the selected vendor as soon as possible, after a thorough review of all submitted proposals.

Q5. Regarding, *IV. Minimum Criteria, #10*, the RFP contains a statement that all proposals not meeting the Minimum Criteria will be immediately disqualified. It is every vendor's goal to provide the highest quality software and service to its municipal clients. However, after a technical review of the document, if a vendor has alternative answers to particular requirements that would benefit the City, would the City consider a proposal containing such an alternative answer?

A5. If proposers wish to suggest alternative approaches, please provide a detailed description of the suggested alternative in writing to the Purchasing Department on or before the deadline for asking questions. If the City agrees that the suggested alternative provides added value, the City will then issue an addendum to the RFP to incorporate the suggested alternative into the Request For Proposals (RFP); thus giving all proposers the ability to offer proposals that include such alternatives. Note that it is not in the City's interest to disqualify proposers on a technicality: proposers not meeting the Minimum Criteria may be disqualified, i.e., any deficiency must have some materiality.

Q6. Regarding, IV. Minimum Criteria, #11, many permit and enforcement providers are not located in Massachusetts. It is acknowledged and understood the City is seeking a high level of support as permit and citation programs are highly visible and directly affect the quality of constituents' lives in Newton, revenue, and municipal employees day to day work. This requirement may disqualify several otherwise qualified vendors from responding to the City. As the service provided is primarily software (though handheld hardware is also included), qualified vendors with robust support infrastructure are capable of resolving any technical or software issues remotely. Would the City consider a bid that proposes remote support?

A6. We understand that support can often be done remotely, but there are times when on-site, in-person support is needed to address an issue with handheld devices. The vendor must be able to provide both in-person and remote support.

Q7. Regarding Scope of Services "The selected contractor must be able to implement all requirements of the contract on July 1, 2023. Failure to meet this requirement will allow the City of Newton to terminate immediately." : As most implementations take a minimum of 3 months, and transitions of Newton's size and complexity can often extend past that timeline, would the City be open to extending the timeline (6 months) OR a phased implementation approach? The intention of this ask is to ensure a quality transition should a new vendor be selected to maintain the quality and integrity of data and processes.

A7. It is expected that if a new vendor is selected there will be a reasonable transition period. The expectation provided in the RFP refers to the ability of the vendor to be able to begin the transition period no later than July 1, 2023. If a new vendor is selected from this process, it will be expected that the City and the vendor will immediately meet to map out an implementation plan.

Q8. The City mentions cost as being part of the evaluation criteria. However, the evaluation criteria descriptions do not mention cost. Can the City please clarify how much cost will weigh in a decision of award or if the award will be given to the lowest bidder?

A8. The RFP process require the evaluation of non-price responses before the price proposals are opened. Non-price criteria are evaluated first, then after non-price criteria are taken into consideration, the price proposals are opened and the non-price and price proposals are evaluated together.

Q9. If cost is part of the consideration of the evaluation would the City be willing to disclose the budget/charges for the current system?

A9. Budget/charges for the current system are public records and proposers may request these public records at any time should they wish to do so.

Q10. Can the City please provide a breakdown of the number of permits issued annually or historically by type of permit?

A10. In 2022, 219 special permits were issued, 215 resident permits were issued, 1000 visitor placards were issued, and 80 business placards were issued.

Q11. As registration look ups via DMV and DMV holds can only be performed for registered owners in the state they were issued, can the City clarify the need for DMV integrations with Florida, Connecticut, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New Hampshire? Standard industry practice for out-of-state unpaid ticket registered owner look-ups is acquired via the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS). Skip-tracing via advanced collections can also be used to acquire unpaid offender information.

A11. This function is handled by the current vendor which deals with RMVs to collect unpaid fees on the City's behalf.

Q12. If a vendor's handhelds do not have radio frequency or integrations with meters, signs, etc. but do have an in-field report an officer can electronically submit with information including fields like broken meter numbers, that is emailed directly to the appropriate department, would this be acceptable?

A12. The vendor's handhelds must directly interface with all of the City's parking meter payment systems, including IPS Group and Passport parking payments.

Q13. Regarding the requirement, *The RMV's Interface System must accommodate all scenarios where a license plate number and type have been issued to more than one registrant at different periods of time. The system must correctly assign tickets to the license plate owner who is responsible for their issuance.*: If a vendor does not have an account-based system, but does have the ability to search by various data points or fields that will pull up all citation data, including the number/amount of unpaid citations and various vehicles associated with that name, would this be acceptable?

A13. Please clarify the question.

Q14. Regarding the requirement, *"The Vendor shall add to or edit Master Violations File records license plate and registrant information, including but not limited to the following: name, address, vehicle make, driver's license number, date of birth, plate issue date, confirmation date of received request, expiration date of license plate, RMV error code, plate type and plate color, and custodial data for leased vehicles if available"*: As third party vendors are performing registered owner lookups and need permission from municipalities to do so on their behalf, many providers only request certain information and exclude any items that might be deemed as not relative or sensitive information. If a vendor can provide necessary information but not items like birthdate, would this be acceptable? Or if birthdates can be manually added to a profile?

A14. Upon further review, the City does not consider date of birth to be a field that should be included in this requirement.

Q15. Can the City provide any details on goals, updates, or changes it is looking to accomplish with this procurement?

A15. The City of Newton's goal is to provide an integrated parking enforcement, ticket payment, and ticket appeals system, that provides a high level of customer service for all resident and visitors to Newton, and ease of use for City staff.

All other terms and conditions of this bid remain unchanged.

**PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU ACKNOWLEDGE ALL ADDENDA ON YOUR
BID FORM. FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE ALL ADDENDA COULD
RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR BID AS NONRESPONSIVE.**

Thank you.



Nicholas Read
Chief Procurement Officer