

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
PARKING ACCESS AND REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEM (PARCS)
FOR THE CITY OF STOCKTON,
CALIFORNIA (PUR 21-019R)**

ADDENDUM No. 2

DATE: 10/7/21

To All Potential Proponents:

A. This Addendum shall be considered part of the proposal documents for the above-mentioned project as though it had been issued at the same time and shall be incorporated integrally therewith. Where provisions of the following supplementary data differ from those of the original proposal documents, this Addendum shall govern and take precedence. PROPONENTS MUST SIGN THE ADDENDUM AND SUBMIT IT WITH THEIR PROPOSALS.

B. Proponents are hereby notified that they shall make any necessary adjustments in their estimates as a result of this Addendum. It will be construed that each Proponent's Proposal is submitted with full knowledge of all modifications and supplemental data specified herein.

Deadline Change:

Proposal Due Date has been extended to Thursday, December 2, 2020, by 2:00 PM.

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS/ANSWERS/CHANGES TO (PUR PUR 21-019R). THE CITY'S RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED ARE IN BLUE

Questions & Answers

1. Do you have a tentative start date for this job?
It is anticipated that the contract will go to City council for approval in January 2022 and the project would start soon after that.

2. Can the City provide an Excel version of Attachment A – Bid Sheets?
Attached under Specifications, Bid Forms- Excel. The Forms are attached as a workbook with a separate tab for each garage. The garage tabs are for data entry and are linked to roll up into the *Summary* tab. The only entry that should be made directly into the *Summary* tab is data placed in the *PARCS Software Costs (Schedule B)* section and in the *PARCS Supporting Costs (Schedule C)*. This workbook has been attached in excel as well as PDF format as a courtesy to Proposers. The formulas are not locked, so entry made over formulas will create errors within the workbook. **The City is not responsible for errors made in the spreadsheets. It is advised that all proposers check their calculations to assure accuracy.**

3. On Page 4. System Description – General the RFP text reads “electronic count system with occupancy sensing devices to provide real-time occupancy on a particular floor of

each parking facility. On Page 38 Section 6.1 City Responsibilities the RFP text reads “City will provide all readily available plans....” Please provide architectural drawings or “striping plans” of each garage that show the quantity and physical dimensions of:

- a. The interior ramps between each of the levels/roof
- b. Each of the garages’ entrance and exit lanes

All available garage plans have been provided for download under the Plans, Attachments, & Agendas Section of the City’s Website, Bid Flash; [http://www.stocktonca.gov/services/business/bidFlash/projDetail.html?dept=Economic Development,idnum=PUR-21-019R](http://www.stocktonca.gov/services/business/bidFlash/projDetail.html?dept=Economic%20Development,idnum=PUR-21-019R)

4. On Page 12. Dynamic Space Count System (DSCS) the RFP Text reads “communicates with up to 255 count signs: static and variable message”. Static signs typically only have fixed text, nothing electronic or variable. What sort of communication does the City envision with a static sign?

255 count signs was listed in error. Please disregard such reference/need. The City requires space count signs to be placed at minimum upon entry to each floor. The reference to variable and static, is in reference to the minimum ability to program the exterior digital/count signs to allow custom messaging, for instant to note event named parkin; in addition to the more “static” or automatic messaging that would state when there are “available spaces” or the garage is “full”.

5. On Page 12. Dynamic Space Count System (DSCS) the RFP Text reads “accurately identify occupancy to a floor, sector, or zone, and at each entry and exit lane for accurately detecting vehicle traffic flow.” Please list the number of particular sectors or zones within each garage that the DSCS must individually count.

The City requires not less than one space count sign per floor of each garage. In order to maintain accurate accounting of available spaces by floor, all entry/exit points must be covered at a minimum.

6. On Page 13 LED Dynamic Space Available Signage the RFP text reads “Setting parking space variance values.” And under Summary Bid Sheet it reads “LED Level Count Sign”. This section references entrance LED signs. However, Summary Bid sheet only lists level count signs. Please clarify whether the City desires pricing for both entrance and interior level signs. If yes, please revise the Summary Bid Sheet accordingly.

Noted. Financial Sheets corrected to include Entrance LED Sign(s).

7. On Page 19 Virtual Server Environment & Associated Systems the RFP text reads “Proponent shall detail the Total Cost of Ownership/Maintenance/Support over three, five, and ten-year periods. (Must include labor to install firmware, software updates, and security patches as necessary.) And on Page 21 Software Upgrades the RFP text reads “All software and all software updates/upgrades shall be provided to the City of Stockton for a minimum of five (5) years at no cost.” Additionally, on the Summary Bid Sheet the RFP states “Garage Service/Maintenance Costs for Years 1&2 @ are included in the contract. There are lines to provide pricing for Years 3-7 but not our to Year 10. Please clarify the discrepancies between these sections.

Amend page 19, Virtual Server Environment & Associated System as follows: “Proponent shall detail the Total Cost of Ownership/Maintenance/Support **over a minimum of seven-years.**”

Amend Page 21 Software Upgrades the RFP text to read: “All software and all software updates/upgrades shall be provided to the City of Stockton for a minimum of **two (2)** years at no cost.”

8. Can the City provide drawings for each of the 5 garages showing the ground floor entrances and the ramps to the upper levels?
See response number 3.
9. The RFP makes it plain that the City wants a Hosted PARCS solution and that the Proponent is responsible for all Network requirements inside the garage. This is no problem. In a hosted environment such as this the big question is: Is the City providing the outside internet connection from each of the 5 garages? If not would the City accept a sub-contract for internet services through proponent awarded the contract?
See Addendum 1 for response.
10. Given the considerable amount of infrastructure work and the option for LPR, can an extension be granted to allow for enough amount of time to accommodate working with the necessary subcontractor teams?
The City has received multiple requests for an extension to the due date for the proposal, given the shared concern among proposers, the City will amend the proposal due date to **December 2, 2020** by 2:00 PM. All other requirements remain as stated.
11. Can the City please clarify whether 3 or 5 project references are desired?
A minimum of 3 references are required, 5 is desirable.
12. Can the City please confirm what the bond requirements are for this RFP, bid, security, and/ or performance, if any?
See Addendum 1 for response regarding a Bid Bond. See page ii, *Notice Inviting Proposals* for required bond amounts of successful Proposer.
13. Re: Proximity cards—will current users (parkers w/proximity cards) need to be integrated into the new system or will new parkers and current parkers all receive the new proximity cards requested in the RFP?
Account information of existing card holders must be integrated, however new cards or technology may be used for vehicle entry.
14. Can you clarify where the demarcation points for the internet in the garages (Market St Garage, SEB Garage, Coy Garage, Channel Garage and Arena Garage)
None of the garages have Internet connection at this time. The City is responsible for providing Internet to the garages and will work with the successful proposer regarding logical/possible placement of the Internet connection point.
15. Could you please confirm that the City would like level count monument signs at all garage entry plaza's? If not, could you please list exceptions?
The City requires a minimum of Entrance LED Signage at each entrance, available spaces, listed by floor is not required of the Entrance LED Signage.

16. Do you want to monitor and therefore display on monument sign availability of the ADA spaces on the ground floor of the Arena Garage? Is this ADA only parking?
The ground floor of the Arena Garage is ADA only and does not need an available space sign for that level.
17. Does the city want to maintain all current reversible lane configurations at all the garages or list exceptions?
Yes. We need the flexibility for all lanes at all Garages, with the exception of the far-north entrance lane on Center Street of SEB Garage, and Channel garage lanes.
18. Does the City want to reuse the car exiting signals (activated with open gate arm at SEB, Channel, Coy and Market Street garages) and open close lights currently in place at all locations (not the LED signs mention on pg 13 of RFP).
If the current lights are functional, can be integrated with the new system, and would be considered a reasonable component for a state-of-the-art PARCS system, then their re-use is permissible.
19. Given the complexity of the 5-garage project and the short timeframe from questions answered, HUB would like to request a one week extension of the due date to October 28th. This project requires a PARCS vendor to rely on the response from multiple suppliers and vendors. The timeframe is very short to get proper responses.
See response to number 10, above.
20. Page 1 – 2.0 Scope of work – Hosted PARCS management software & Reports. Please confirm that only a Hosted PARCS system is the only acceptable solution and that a local server based system will be rejected.
A hosted PARCS Management System is required.
21. During the walk through it was stated that the City would be providing high speed internet service to each garage. Please confirm this in writing.
See Addendum 1 for written confirmation.
22. During the walk through it was stated that the City would provide the pricing sheets in Excel with the ability to edit. Please confirm.
See response number 2.
23. Page 1 – 2.0 Scope of work – The scope states that the 5 garages will be done in order with Coy Garage first, with an estimated completion dates that would have all 5 garages done within 1 year. The same paragraph contains a reference that the contract amount will be limited by a not to exceed approved funding amount. Realistically all 5 garages can likely be completed well within a year's timeframe.
 - a. Question: What is the estimated approved budget amount? This can have a major bearing on the last 1 or 2 garages costs if they exceed an unknown budget amount and complete in 2023. Inflation is rampant and costs are rising. The other reason to share this as an estimate is it's very possible for a PARCS vendor to dip into lower margins to hit a target amount to win the entire project.

The City has chosen, intentionally, not to disclose the current amount of funding available for this project.

24. ParkMobile is mentioned in the RFP as a payment application. Is ParkMobile a required application for the project or just a recommendation that the City would like to see mobile payment applications included in the project?
Parkmobile is currently the only application used within the City of Stockton's Parking program, though it is not exclusive. There is no intention to discontinue the use of Parkmobile and therefore integration is necessary.
25. Manned booths – Normally all the manned booths would be replaced by cash accepting Pay Stations to eliminate labor costs. However, the City has a major homeless problem. The question is can the City protect cash accepting pay stations if they are utilized in a PARCS solution? If not they will be destroyed in a matter of weeks. Therefore keeping the manned booths would be a better solution for cash acceptance. The City has converted from single space meters on the street to payment machines due to past, rampant vandalism and theft. The current payment machines to date have not experienced theft, though some have been vandalized. Eliminating staffed booths is not a requirement of this project but can be considered as an option.
26. Coy Garage – should all 4 lanes be able to accept both transient and monthly parkers or is one lane reserved for monthly parkers only?
The City desires flexibility so that lane use can be modified as needs dictate.
27. Market Garage – The west side has both transient and monthly capabilities. Currently the eastside is for monthly only. Does the City wish to keep the eastside monthly only or would the City prefer to have both transient and monthly parkers use the east side?
Flexibility is desirable, however there are no plans to alter the flow of monthlies from the east entrance.
28. SEB Garage- Currently the west side of the garage is used for monthly parkers as all the lane equipment is broken. Does the City wish to keep the Westside monthly only or have all lanes be able to handle both monthly and transient parkers?
The City desires flexibility so that lane use can be modified as needs dictate, with the exception of the far north gate on the Center Street side, which will always remain monthly only.
29. Grill doors – Each of the garages has some type of grill doors that can be closed after hours. Currently it is our understanding that LAZ is opening and closing these doors manually. Will this procedure continue or does the City have a requirement that the PARCS system control the outside grill doors?
Automated (card key, etc) control of the grill doors to the garages is included in this current project, as all garages may need to be accessed by residents or downtown staff, during non-staffed hours.

30. Lane UPS units – Please confirm that All entry and exit lanes are required to have lane UPS units. This would include the cashier booths if PARCS fee computers are being utilized? This would apply to any Pay Stations proposed as well?
UPS battery back up will be required in all points of the system where customer ingress/egress is necessary. The new system must have a means of suspending or holding transaction and ingress/egress history while allowing customers to get in or out of the facility.
31. Page 9 item F. – EMV P2P Credit Card readers on entry stations. Please confirm that EMV credit card readers are required on all transient entry stations in all garages. If not on all garages, please specify which garage and how many lanes each garage.
EMV credit card payment must be an option at all garages except for Channel garage which is intended to remain Monthly only. The location and quantity of EMV credit card readers, will not be determined by the City, but rather is the responsibility of the proposer based on the functionality and design of their respective system.
32. Dynamic Space Count System – As a PARCS vendor we intend to partner with a state of the art, camera based PGS vendor to provide the system the City requires. As the PARCS vendor we would treat them as any other sub-contractor, we take their “number” and apply a markup margin. As the City has a limited budget, would the City allow both the PARCS vendor and the PGS vendor to supply separate proposals to the City? This would save the City money but would require the City to issue contracts to two separate companies. PARCS vendor would be responsible for service and maintenance after installation. Would the City approve of this concept?
The City will not entertain multiple direct contracts for supporting mechanisms, technology, or services, but rather will enter one contract; holding that one company for full project delivery. The awarded contractor may use sub-contractors to fulfill the responsibility of delivering a turn-key system to the City.
33. LPR Option – Page 30 – Would the City expand upon what the operational intent is for the LPR systems in each of the garages. If it is for speeding up traffic flow entering or exiting the garage there are issues that negate LPR’s functionality:
- a. Almost all entry lanes are too short to allow pre-capture of incoming plates. Post capture is possible but that negates some of the specifications requirement on page 31.
 - b. Capturing front plate at entry is possible but the reality is roughly 15% of California vehicles do not have front plate even though it is required by the State.
 - c. With the exception of the Stadium garage, all garage exits dump out on busy City streets which will be the limiting factor on how fast cars can exit.
 - d. The HID MaxiProx requirement will be able to have monthly parkers exit almost as quickly as the LPR system
 - e. With the above limitations, does the City still want to include the LPR as an option? If so please specify if post capture or front license plate capture is preferred as there is a cost difference between the two options.

The City is interested in considering the option of LPR. It is listed as an add-alternate as the City is not sure whether the technology of LPR would be efficient or cost effective in some or all of the existing garages. The City will refrain from determining pre or post capture as desirable, thus allowing each proposal to make recommendations, given the current garage construction. Explanation regarding add alternate recommendation and its pricing, will be considered.

34. VOIP Intercoms – The City has retained LAZ Parking as an operator. LAZ has a National Command Center that has unlimited licenses for VOIP intercoms. The question is can a PARCS vendor utilize the LAZ Command Center for the backend of the intercom system? The benefits are all the local controls, Command Stations, phone tree rolling to cell phones is 100% possible with the added benefit of after-hours calls handled by the LAZ Command Center as it is manned 24/7.

The scope of this project includes the functionality/ability for the system to be responded to locally, phone tree, roll to alternate phone(s), etc. The proposer is not responsible for providing the service or staffing to respond to customers. For clarification purposes, should there be a functional issue with the system, the proposer is responsible for responding to service calls.

35. Validations – Does the City utilize validations in the City garages? **Yes.** If so would the City prefer to use chaser ticket validations or Web Validations, or a combination of both? **The City would like the ability to utilize both.** If the City would like to use Web Validations, how many out merchants or City Departments would be issuing validations? 10-20 or more. Please provide estimate as it affects pricing. **Best estimate 50-100.**

36. RPF Page# 4 of Template with Bonds Only / Exhibit 5 Topic: Bid Bond *RFP Text: Contractor shall provide the following Surety Bonds: 1. Bid bond 2. Performance bond* Question: While the RFP indicates that a bid bond is required, it does not provide the requirements for this bid bond, i.e. percentage or amount. Would the City please confirm whether a bid bond is required and, if it is, provide the specific instructions and requirements for the bid bond?

See response to number 12, above.

37. RPF Page# 57 or 9-1 of "Final" document Topic: 9.0 PROPOSAL EXHIBITS *RFP Text: 9.0 PROPOSAL EXHIBITS* Question: The RFP references this document but does not include it. If pertinent to this RFP, would the City please provide document 9.0?

All technical specifications are provided through the links on the City's website, under Bid Flash, specification and Plans, Attachments & Agendas, located at: http://www.stocktonca.gov/services/business/bidFlash/projDetail.html?dept=Economic_Development,idnum=PUR-21-019R

38. RPF Page# 12 & 13 of "Final" document *RFP Text: Communicates with up to 255 count signs: static and variable message.* Question: The RFP references having up to 255

Signs. Please provide additional clarification as to where these are located and confirm the requirement for 255 signs. How many signs are required by level and for capacity?

[See response to number 4, above.](#)

39. RPF Page# 2 of "Final" document, Topic: Garages & Lanes

Question: We would like to ask the following questions, related to the hardware requirements for these garages.

- Channel Garage - Does the City desire that the PARCS vendor control pedestrian doors? [Yes.](#)
- Coy Garage - Does the City desire that the PARCS vendor have transient & monthly pedestrian access? [Yes.](#)
- Coy Garage - Is 1 POF required in the scope of work, or can we provide Tap-to-Pay and eliminate this piece of hardware? [Yes.](#)
- SEB Garage - El Dorado Street - Does the City desire that the PARCS vendor have transient & monthly pedestrian access? [Monthly, Yes. Transient, not required.](#)
- SEB Garage - Center Street - Does the City desire to keep all lanes monthly only? [See response to number 28, above.](#)
- SEB Garage - Center Street - Does the City desire that the PARCS vendor have transient & monthly pedestrian access? [Monthly, Yes. Transient, No.](#)
- Arena Garage - Does the City desire that the PARCS vendor have transient & monthly ped access? [Yes.](#)

40. RPF Page# 4 of "Final" document Topic: Valet & Event Parking

RFP Text: Arena Garage... is a mass entry/exit facility given its event driven nature.

Question: Is the City interested in a Valet/Event Parking system for the Arena Garage or any others?

[Nothing precludes Proposer from suggesting such solution.](#)

41. Topic: Request for Extension Question: In order to thoroughly assess and quote the needs for power and internet for each individual parking garage, we will need to schedule an additional site visit with our local partners. Because of this impact to the schedule, we would like to request an extension on behalf of all vendors.

Additionally, the current schedule indicates that questions will be answered just 2 days after they are submitted. We typically see addendums and clarifications provided for RFP's up to a week after questions are submitted. Considering the amount of time we may have between receipt of the final addendum and the RFP Due Date, as well as the time needed to prepare and ship our response, we respectfully request that the City consider an extension of one or two additional weeks to the submission deadline. We believe that it would be in the City's best interests to provide this extension, as it would allow them to receive the most thorough and thoughtful proposals from all vendors including important planning related to power and internet. Not only would the extension allow them to make the most educated decision possible, it would also assist in preparing for a smoother installation process, by ensuring that the vendors have ample time to become familiar with all of the City's needs.

[See response to number 10, above.](#)

42. What is the "central" facility location where power and internet will be provided? Will power and internet be provided not only to the facility but to each lane?
 See response number 14 , above regarding Internet service. All garages have electrical power, however if it is found that the amount of power available in the garage does not meet the needs of the proposed system, the City is responsible for increased power distribution to the garage. Like the Internet service, Proposer is responsible for all power distribution as needed within the facilities.
43. The following is our standard UPS approach. Will the City accept this plan? *Battery backup shall be provided for barrier to be raised in the event of a facility power failure.*
 See response number 30, above.
44. Roll up gates: is the vendor in responsible entirely for the connections of the roll up gates at the locations, or is there a dry connect to loops only?
 See response to number 29, above.
45. Took a closer look at the Coy garage and realized there used to be a reversible exit lane in place that is now blocked off. Does the City want to add equipment in this lane or just leave it as is? With a new system it would take LAZ about a minute to flip it from an entrance to an exit. My thought is for a 1-2 hour window it would help flush cars out of the garage with 2 lanes instead of one. That said Laz would need an attendant on hand to stop cars from trying to enter the garage during that window of time.
 The City desires maximum flexibility in all lanes at Coy garage.
46. Please provide architectural drawings or "striping plans" of each garage that show the quantity and physical dimensions of:
 a) The interior ramps between each of the levels/roof
 b) Each of the garages' entrance and exit lane

The only plans available are those that have already uploaded.

PROPONENT MUST ACKNOWLEDGE THIS ADDENDUM BY SIGNING BELOW AND ATTACHING THE SIGNED ADDENDUM TO THE PROPOSAL:

Company Name _____

Contact Person _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Proposals Due – Promptly by 2:00 P.M., Thursday, **December 2, 2020 by 2:00 PM**, at the City Clerk's Office.

-----City of Stockton Use Only below this line-----

Addendum acknowledged and signed? _____ (Procurement Specialist's initials)