The City of
WORCESTER

Administration & Finance – Purchasing Division
Christopher J. Gagliastro, MCPPO – Purchasing Director
455 Main Street, Room 201, Worcester, MA 01608
P | 508-799-1220
purchasing@worcesterma.gov

June 5, 2025

To All Proposers:

Subject: **RFP No. CR-8446-W6, Parking Citations, Permits, Mobile App Management Services / DTM**

ADDENDUM NO. 5

To Whom It May Concern:

With reference to our proposal request relative to the above subject, please refer to the changes/modifications/clarifications to the original proposal request.

- **PLEASE SEE BELOW QUESTIONS RECEIVED AND CLARIFICATIONS FROM CITY**

1. In addendum 3 the City mentions M&T Bank providing lockbox services and vendors needing to load payments from the lockbox M&T bank manages. M&T Bank is not mentioned in the RFP and all of the requirements read as if the City wants vendors to provide their own integrated lockbox services, which is much more common. Can the City explain the current lockbox workflow? How do tickets paid at M&T get into the City's current citation management system?

   The parking ticket contains a scanline, and payments made via check are mailed to a P.O. Box (M&T Bank Lockbox). M&T sends payment information to the Vendor to update their system. All payments made to the Vendor are deposited to the City's bank account daily.

2. Is the City open to vendors proposing integrated lockbox processing services in which the vendor receives all mailed-in payments, processes them, and updates the master citation database accordingly?

   No.

3. If not, has the City confirmed with M&T Bank that it is willing to integrate with parking citation vendors?

   Yes, they will integrate.

The City of
WORCESTER

4. Can the City update the pricing sheet to reflect the vendor's responsibility for handheld wireless plan costs? A fixed line item is preferred, as these costs are static and necessary for system operation regardless of the 40%/60% payment structure
    No.

5. "Is the City open to evaluating alternative pricing models? No

    The proposed 40% upon issuance / 60% upon payment structure places disproportionate risk on the vendor, as the software and services are fully operational regardless of whether a constituent pays their ticket. Tying the majority of compensation to constituent behavior—something outside the vendor's control—is not consistent with typical per-ticket issuance pricing models and presents challenges from both a risk and billing standpoint."

6. If so, is the City open to a monthly recurring software licensing fee line item? No

7. If not, is the City calculating the 40% when issued and 60% when paid? Or is that the vendor's responsibility? The calculation is 40% issued and 60% paid to be calculated by the vendor and verified by the City.

8. Confirming on handwritten ticket data entry - the vendor's system just needs to be able to support City staff entering tickets manually, and City staff will upload scanned images. There will be no vendor involvement in this process outside of hosting the software and functionality?

    Correct, City staff will enter in tickets manually along with the scanned image.

9. "The City is requesting that a vendor host a virtual permitting program, but also asks that vendors review all mail and online applications and approve or deny them according to City rules. This appears inconsistent with other parts of the bid, where the City requests system functionality that allows City staff to perform similar functions. Is the City open to a system in which City staff review and approve or deny applications using the vendor's software?" The vendor is to host a virtual permitting program and review all mail and online applications and approved or deny them according to the City rules.

10. Can the City confirm that it is not requesting any "secondary" or "special" collections in which debt is assigned to vendors? It looks as if a normal delinquent processing workflow is all that is in the bid but would like to confirm.

    Yes, it is confirmed.

The City *of*
WORCESTER

11. In addendum 3 the City mentions all payments (outside of lockbox), online and in-person, be processed by Tyler Technologies, but the RFP also states "The vendor will also host and support the agency's online payment system for citations and residential parking permits. Can proponents offer their own merchant processing and gateway services to process online ticket payments and permit sales?

    Yes.

12. If all payments being processed by Tyler is a requirement, can the City confirm that any vendor-proposed pass-along fees do not include merchant processing and gateway services and those fees will be between Tyler and the City?

    Yes, this is confirmed.

13. As the excise tax functionality involves 2 parties, has the City confirmed with Tyler that it is willing to integrate with and pass excise tax values to the awarded bidder?

    Yes, this is confirmed.

14. Would the City be open to structuring handhelds and printers as a separate line item, rather than rolling them into a per-citation pricing model? These are hard goods and necessary upfront expenses required for the system to launch. Tying approximately 60% of their cost to whether tickets are ultimately paid presents risk and misalignment, especially since the equipment must be procured and deployed before launch regardless of collection rates. We'd appreciate the opportunity to propose a more predictable and transparent pricing structure for these components.

    No

15. What percentage of the City's tickets paid are paid via lockbox processing?

    Approximately 7%

16. With material differences in the initial bid requirements doc and the Q&A addendum is the City open to extending the deadline to answer all clarifying questions thoroughly?
    No, the due date of 6/25/25 remains in place.

17. **Ticket Book Layout & Part Details**

   o   Could you please confirm the **number of parts** in each ticket (e.g., 2-part, 3-part, etc.)?

       1st White 2nd Yellow and 3rd White Envelope

   o   What are the **sizes** for each part?

       1st White 7 ¼ inches x 3 -5/8, 2nd Yellow 7 ¼ inches x 3 -5/8 and 3rd White Envelope 8" X 3-5/8"

   What **color paper** is required for each part?
       1st White   2nd Yellow and 3rd White Envelope

18. **Envelope Construction**

   o   From the sample image, it appears the book may include **crossweb glue to form an envelope**—can you confirm if this is correct?

       Peel and stick tab, not crossweb glue.

19. **Printing Details**

   o   Are the **front and back covers** printed **double-sided**, or single-sided only?

       1st White *single sided* 2nd Yellow *single sided* and 3rd White Envelope double sided one side is address as in mailing envelope

   o   Do all front-facing parts print identically, or are there differences between copies?

       Yes, identical.

   o   Are **all parts printed on the front side only**, or are any parts printed on the reverse?

       1st White *single sided* , 2nd Yellow *single sided* and 3rd White Envelope double sided. One side is an address as in a mailing envelope.

The City *of*
WORCESTER

- o   Is the ink used **Reflex Blue** or **Process Blue**?

  The ink style is micro beads, Reflex Blue.

- ***NO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS WILL BE TAKEN AFTER 4:00 PM ON MONDAY JUNE 16, 2025***

Proposers are requested to acknowledge and/or include this addendum with submission. All other terms, conditions, and specifications remain unchanged.

Very truly yours,

Christopher J. Gagliastro
Purchasing Director