



Finance Department
Purchasing Division

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
Specification No. 23-11578-C
FOR
City of Berkeley Parking Data Analytics Services
PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE OPENED AND READ PUBLICLY

ADDENDUM "A"
3/30/23

Dear Proposer:

Please be aware that the City is **extending the deadline** for Specification No. 23-11578-C City of Berkeley Parking Data Analytics Services to **Thursday, April 20, 2023**.

Questions received from proposers along with answers are attached.

Proposals/bids must be received no later than 2:00 pm, on Thursday, April 20, 2023 All responses should be sent via email to purchasing@berkeleyca.gov and have **"City of Berkeley Parking Data Analytics Services"** and **Specification No. 23-11578-C** indicated in the subject line of the email. Please submit one (1) PDF of the technical proposal. Corresponding cost proposal shall be submitted as a separate PDF document.

Proposals will not be accepted after the date and time stated above.

We look forward to receiving and reviewing your proposal.

Sincerely,

Darryl Sweet
General Services Manager

Addendum “A”
Questions and Answers for Specification No. 23-11578-C
City of Berkeley Parking Data Analytics Services

The City of Berkeley has received questions from some potential respondents regarding **Specification No. 23-11578-C, City of Berkeley Parking Data Analytics Services**. In an effort to provide the same information to all, listed below are the questions received to date, with responses from City staff.

1. Q: Where does your organization or company currently stand in regards to a Data Analytics System Transformation?

1. A: The City has several sources of important parking information, including but not limited to our on-street parking meters (IPS), mobile parking payment service (ParkMobile), and off-street parking garages (SKIDATA). We currently do not have a way of viewing all of this information in one unified location. The City is seeking a hosted system to analyze transaction data, synthesize estimated parking occupancy, and visualize the results to help City staff make informed decisions about parking management.

2. Q: What are the challenges your company is facing?

2. A: See response to Question 1.

3. Q: What is the expectation[s] you have from [Provider]?

3. A: Please refer to the RFP’s Section II Scope of Services (pp. 5-7) for expectations of the Provider during the contract term, and Section III Submission Requirements (pp. 7-11) for expectations of the Provider in submitting a Proposal.

4. Q: In reference to Section II.A “The City has identified a not-to-exceed of \$225,000 for these services”: Do the services referenced include the two consecutive one-year options to extend, or do they only cover the first three mandatory years?

4. A: Ideal funding for the project would be \$225,000 in total over a three-year period. Each additional year of contract extension would be budgeted at \$75,000 per year.

5. Q: In reference to Section IV requiring “adequate proof of required PCI compliance”: Can the city clarify what type of proof it is seeking for PCI compliance?

5. A: See Question 12 for the related question and answer.

After review, the City will not require credit card information to be collected or hosted by Provider. As a result, PCI compliance is no longer a requirement for prospective System Providers under this RFP.

6. Q: In reference to Section III.6 “The Proposer must be able to meet the City’s Payment Card Industry (PCI) compliance requirements”: Can you please confirm the following:

a) The City is requesting a written agreement to comply with the compliance requirements described in Section III.6.a.

b) Compliance requirements (b) through (g) all apply only once a vendor is selected.

6. A: See response to Question 12.

7. Q: In reference to the intro of Section III, “Excluding appendices, the proposal must not exceed fifteen (15) double-sided pages”: Should this be interpreted as 30 single PDF pages?

7. A: The proposer is limited to a total of fifteen (15) double-sided, or a total of thirty (30) single-sided pages, in responding to the RFP. It is the City’s preference to submit RFP’s double-side printed to conserve paper.

8. Q: Will the cover page and table of contents be included in the page count?

8. A: No.

9. Q: In reference to Section III Intro and Section III.3 “Proposal shall not exceed fifteen ... pages” and “Pricing proposals shall be a separate document.”: Does this imply that the pricing proposal is not included in the page count, or will page count be evaluated by adding the pages of these separate documents?

9. A: The pricing proposal will not be counted as part of the 15-page limit.

10. Q: Regarding Section II (A. Contract Term and Budget), can the city help clarify the following:

Is the \$225,000 “not-to-exceed” figure listed referring to an annual cost for the project which is not to be exceeded?

If not, does this represent the total cost across the initial three (3) years or three (3) years plus the two (2) consecutive one-year options not to be exceeded?

10. A: See response to Question 4.

11. Q: Could the city please confirm that they will ensure reliable data access to all required 3rd party integrations via their existing agreements with said partners / data sources (e.g. SkiData, ParkMobile, etc.) during the contract term?

11. A: The City’s contracts for parking meters and license plate readers include provision for data sharing with third-party vendors for parking occupancy data analysis.

12. Q: Regarding Section II (C. 4. PCI Compliance for Third Party Providers (TPSP)), can the city help clarify the following:

What is the purpose of this requirement if the provider will not be collecting personal payment data from the identified 3rd party platforms?

If the chosen provider is able to demonstrate that no connection to 3rd party payment processors is needed to perform the desired function of the City, would PCI compliance still be a requirement?

12. A: After review, the City will not require credit card information to be collected or hosted by Provider. As a result, PCI compliance is no longer a requirement for prospective System Providers under this RFP.

13. Q: Regarding Section III (1. Contractor Identification), can the city help clarify the following: Would the city be willing to share a bidder list / invitation list for the RFP?

13. A: The City sent invitations to Smarking, Turnstone, Populus, and Automotus.

14. Q: How will the costing section scored? Is there a scoring formula?

14. A: Refer to Section IV Selection Criteria for a breakdown of the categories and potential points assigned to each category. The City will evaluate price proposals based on the ability of the Provider to deliver the scope of work within the allocated budget.

15. Q: \$225k pricing per year or full term of contract?

15. A: See response to Question 4.

16. Q: What types of written documentation for vendor integrations will City accept?

16. A: The City simply seeks a document such as a memorandum or diagram that describes which information is being shared from each vendor and by which method (e.g., via transactions via Push API connection).

17. Q: Does Berkeley already have the GIS mapped information related to the parking spaces covered in this RFP or does the City intend for the selected vendor(s) to gather this data?

17. A: The City has a GIS polygon layer for all goBerkeley parking meter areas (as shown in publicly facing web map here: <https://arcg.is/0i9amf>) as well as point data for individual parking meters and pay stations.

18. Q: Does Berkeley intend for the selected vendor(s) to push/pull goBerkeley occupancy parking data via API to an existing website or does the vendor need to set up?

18. A: The City expects the System Provider to set up a hosted website at which occupancy data derived from City's third-party vendors can be accessed by authorized City staff and personnel.

19. Q: Can the City clarify the specified \$225,000 NTE budget: is this an annual amount, the total cost for the proposed 3-year contract, or inclusive of the contract period and optional 2 contract extensions (total of 5 years)?

19. A: See response to Question 4.

20. Q: Can the City clarify its preference on the price proposal format specified in Section III: does 'all inclusive' pertain to the proposed 3-year contract period or does it include pricing for the optional contract extension periods (total of 5 years)?

20. A: See response to Question 4.

21. Q: Has the City previously integrated with these data feeds? Has the City previously used a system like this in a pilot program or other contracts?

21. A: Yes, Conduent was contracted previously for similar services.

22. Q: Is the City interested in increasing the frequency of rate and time limit changes?

22. A: Yes. The City is allowed to implement rate and time limit changes no more frequently than once every 60 days, but is not currently making changes this frequently. However, more frequent rate and/or time limit adjustments guided by a parking data analytics and visualization System would allow the City to be more responsive to changes in parking demand.

23. Q: What is the anticipated timeline to implement the System? When does the City anticipate their first-rate adjustment will be performed after the contract starts?

23. A: The City's goal for the System is for it to be developed and implemented within 3-4 months from receipt of the Notice to Proceed. The schedule for the next rate change will be determined based on the results of occupancy analysis performed by the System.

24. Q: How many Genetec units does the City have?

24. A: The City's Parking Enforcement operation has a total of 22 Genetec AutoVu systems.

25. Q: Can the City provide the results of the studies conducted using LPR?

25. A: Not at this time. Per the City's Surveillance Use Policy for Automated License Plate Readers, license plate information data can only be maintained by the Public Works Department or a third-party data analysis and visualization vendor contracted by Public Works.

26. Q: Will the City still be collecting parking occupancy and/or turnover data separately for the goBerkeley program as part of a separate contract, or will this contract require any manual data collection?

26. A: Routinely, the City will conduct routine spot checking of parking occupancy and/or turnover for special projects such as expanding parking meters in new locations. This contract does not require manual data collection. However, if a Provider believes that manual data collection is necessary for them to complete the scope of work, they should detail in their Proposal along with any cost implications.

27. Q: Is manual collected required for estimating disabled placard use at on-street meters? If yes, how frequently would the manual collection be required?

27. A: The Disabled Placard report was an example of a potential custom report that could be developed by Provider after discussion with the City. Custom reports as identified by the RFP would be developed after further discussion between Provider and the City based on the technical abilities of the System, available data, and/or City resources available to support additional analysis. We welcome feedback from Proposers on potential reports that could add value and assist the City in managing its resources more effectively.

28. Q: Regarding the requirement: System's map-based interface shall have ability to be made available to the public: Does this require public access to a dashboard hosted by the vendor, or could this data be delivered via API to populate a map hosted within the Berkeley infrastructure?

28. A: The City is open to suggestions on the most effective means of communicating parking analysis data to the public in the spirit of transparency.

29. Q: Given the importance of a robust, responsive system in this particular procurement, it is important that Berkeley sees the relevant technology in operation before making a selection. Would the City consider adding a demo requirement to their evaluation during which a shortlist of teams is offered the opportunity to show their systems in action?

29. A: If the City chooses to conduct virtual interviews of the top two (2) Providers, then the City may request a demonstration of each Provider's existing system interface that they intend to deploy in Berkeley.

30. Q: Regarding the listed budget of \$225K, is that for a 3-year engagement?

30. A: See response to Question 4.

Except as provided herein all other terms and conditions remain unchanged.