# CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
## Procurement & Contracting Services Department
### KATJANA BALLANTYNE
### MAYOR

To:     All Parties on Record with the City of Somerville as Holding
        **RFP 22-27 Parking Management Information System**

From:   Thupten Chukhatsang
Date:   3/15/2022
Re:     Extension of deadline for submission of proposals
        Clarification, Revisions and Attachments
        Q&A

**Addendum No. 3 to RFP 22-27**

**Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by signing below and including this form in your proposal package.  Failure to do so may subject the proposer to disqualification.**

**NAME OF COMPANY / INDIVIDUAL:**  _____

**ADDRESS:**_____

**CITY/STATE/ZIP:**_____

**TELEPHONE/FAX/EMAIL:**_____

**SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED INDIVIDUAL:**_____

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDA:**

**Addendum #1 _____  #2 _____  #3_____  #4 _____**

# Addendum No. 3 to RFP 22-27

**Extension of deadline for submission of proposals:**

The City is extending the deadline for submission of proposals by one week. Sealed proposals are now due by **1:00pm, March 23, 2022.**

**Clarifications, Revisions and Attachments:**

1. Clarification regarding the term, "Dedicated **Client Success Representative**", located in Section 2 of the RFP on page 13 of the PDF, in "Specifications/Scope of Service," under the heading "Support":

   The City wants to clarify that the term "Client Success Representative" stated above is not intended as a specific job title but more of a generic description of the role. The City wants the vendor to provide a dedicated account representative or customer service representative assigned to swiftly respond to the City of Somerville's service requests. This requirement is intended to help the City successfully respond to technical issues in a timely manner. We want the person or persons assigned to the City of Somerville to be familiar with the City's systems and history so that resolution of potential issues is swift when the time arises.

2. Revisions: Any/all references to "bid" in this RFP should be changed to "proposals" or "RFP" as appropriate.

3. Attachment: The Quality Requirements section has been revised and replaces the previous version. The quality requirements are a minimum requirement and must have affirmative responses. The revised version is attached below in **Appendix A: Revised Quality Requirements Form. Please complete this version.**

4. Attachment: The Comparative Evaluation Criteria has also been revised and is attached below in **Appendix B: Revised Comparative Evaluation Criteria.**

**Questions & Answers:**

1. Regarding Quality Requirements #37: "*Interface with other online systems, such as department's website and any other payment providers?*" – can the City specify the other payment providers?

Answer: At this time we have Invoice Cloud, may have other vendors in the future.

2. The City requests that "The Vendor shall provide a fully integrated 'Point of Sale' (POS) Payment Processing System," but later states that "The vendor must be able to integrate with current and future credit card processor that the City chooses. Invoice Cloud processes payments for over the counter, point of sales devices..." Is it the City's expectation that the selected Vendor will replace Invoice Cloud?

Answer: No.

3. Section 2.0 Specifications/Scope of Services – Request for Massachusetts Vehicle Owner Information states: "*Each month, the Vendor must acquire the Massachusetts RMV's monthly file of all registrants.*" Can the City

clarify the use case for this monthly file?

Answer: For purposes of sending out notices to the RMV who will clear the reporting.

4. Section 2.0 Specifications/Scope of Services – Key Components states: *"The system must also include the following capabilities: Management and control functions including the reporting of enforcement unit management."* Can the City please clarify what qualifies as an enforcement unit? Furthermore, can further details be provided on what the reporting of enforcement units will look like and entail?

Answer: This is a function which allows for reporting of live and prior dates of enforcement. It can be broken down by each Parking Control Officer as well as type of citation.  Any other enforcement reporting is welcome.

5. Regarding Quality Requirements #5.f. "*Link plates for Municipality state swaps*" – can the City provide additional information on what is required for this functionality?

Answer:  It refers to a direct line with the RMV to support linking plate swap history of old & replacement registrations of vehicles, but we are not 100% clear on what this is or what the requirements are to accomplish this.  Please check with the RMV for exact requirements of this functionality.

6. Section 2.0 Specifications/Scope of Services – Permit Parking System states: "*Provide additional variable pricing for permits based on specific customer characteristics, should the Parking Department decide to implement some form of means-testing for permit pricing, or for another reason that leads to there being more than one single price for resident permits*." What source of data is the City going to use to determine which citizens are eligible for means-testing permit pricing?

Answer: At this time we have individual situations where the city offers free permits. For example, new residents to the city (30 days) and anyone over the age of 65 and is considered a senior are currently eligible for free permits.

7. Payment Methods and Processing requirements state, "*The City requires that the Vendor passes on all credit/debit card transaction convenience fees to the customer dictated by the City's contract with Invoice Cloud as its credit card processor. The City reserves the right to opt to absorb these fees at its own discretion.*"  Would the City be open to charging a convenience fee bundled with the processing fee to violators for online payments in order to offset the cost to the City?

Answer: Not at this time.

8. Regarding Comparative Evaluation Criteria #1: "Handling of Data Requests," can the City confirm that "registrant data requests" are referring to registered owner lookups?

Answer:  Yes

9. Would the City be open to the Vendor serving as the Merchant of Record for payment processing?

Answer:   Only for IVR and Pay-by-Web for permits and tickets.

10. Section 2.0 SPECIFICATIONS/SCOPE OF SERVICES: Permit Parking System, states: "*Provide additional variable pricing for permits based on specific customer characteristics, should the Parking Department decide to implement some form of means-testing for permit pricing, or for another reason that leads to there being more than one single price for resident permits.*" Can the City elaborate on which specific customer characteristics or means-testing approaches might be variable in the future?

Answer: Similar to question 6 but pending the city's strategic plan in the future.

11. Scoring Guide #12 States it is highly advantageous if the proposer has experience with a user friendly mobile application for meter payments, ticket payments and permit payments. However, while meter payments are mentioned in the overview, there isn't a section in the RFP response to include any information regarding this type of technology. If a proposer also has a mobile payment application, should information be included in the response?

Answer: It can be but is not required.

12. Given that some of the respondents are cloud-based SaaS solutions, are there other security and technical review processes that could replace the sharing of source code?

Answer: The City is willing to review appropriate language suggested by the cloud-based SaaS solution provider if the vendor is considered for an award.

13. What's the City's backlog on the Parking Operations outstanding debt?

Answer: The Parking Department has about 153,675 unpaid tickets with outstanding receivables about $8.6m.

14. What company provides your current financial system (software). Please provide the name, version and database?

Answer: MUNIS SAAS version 11.3, from Tyler Technologies Inc.

15. Can the City please provide a data entry flow for ordering and distributing a permit?

Answer: **In person**:
- Constituent comes into the office to get permit(s) with required documentation.
- If all the documentation is in order the permit(s) can be issued at that time

**Online**
- Constituent signs into the online portal and requests the permits provided online
  - Proper documentation needs to be uploaded for review.
- The permit request goes into a review queue for the office staff to review request
- Once a review is completed office staff will either approve or deny
- Denied requested will be determined by office staff based on business rules, automated email will be sent out. Specific denial notices are selected to ensure proper letter is sent for reason of denial.

- Approved requests, constituent will receive notice to go back and log into online portal and make payment.
- Once payment is received the permit(s) requested are moved to a fulfillment queue to be issued.

16. Can the City please elaborate on "Configurable to match existing permit data entry flow, for easy transition?"

    Answer: Implementation of permit data entry flow for accuracy and efficiency.

17. I had a quick question about the RFP.  It mentions a mobile LPR solution, but I can't tell if that is a requirement for the bid or if it is just something each responding company should be able to provide at a later date.  Could you help me to confirm this?

    Answer: Not required at this time but welcome at a later date.

18. Quality Requirements Form   Page 62 is the same as page 61 except the last sentence, "If a selected response requires clarification or commentary, please attach a supplementary page with the commentary for the items", is missing from page 62. Please clarify whether both pages should be included in the response or which page should be used.

    Answer: Please use the revised Quality Requirements Form attached in Appendix A below and disregard the old Quality Requirements Form.

19. If the Offeror would like to include additional or optional services, in which section should it be included.

    Answer: Additional options have not been requested but may be provided in both the non-price technical section and price proposals sections appropriately. Do not list the prices in the technical section. Make sure that the additional options are clearly labelled and separate from the required items.

20. Methods of Bid Submission: Are there any restrictions on the file size that can be uploaded to BidExpress?

    Answer: Bid Express has a limit of 10MB per file slot. I have added additional/optional file slots to upload larger files as needed. They will be labelled "Additional Space (if required)".

21. Non-Price (Technical) Proposal Format (Page 7) states, "Responses shall be prepared on standard 8.5 x 11 inch paper (charts may be landscaped but must be on 8.5 x 11 inch paper) and shall be in a legible font size (12).  The RFP requires Bidders to respond using 12-point font." May Bidders use a smaller, still readable font for each of the following: a) headers and footers b) requirement text c) figures/graphics d) tables

    Answer: Yes, if it isn't too small.

22. Non-Price (Technical) Proposal Format (Page 7) states, "All pages of each response shall be

appropriately numbered (and with consecutive page numbering across tabs)." Can Bidders number the pages consecutively by major section (i.e., 1-1, 2-1, and 3-1)?

Answer: Yes.

23. Non-Price (Technical) Proposal Format (Page 7) states, "All pages of each response shall be appropriately numbered (and with consecutive page numbering across tabs)." Can Bidders exclude each of the following from the consecutive numbering requirement: a) signed forms b) attachments c) table of contents?

    Answer: Yes.

24. Non-Price (Technical) Proposal Format (Page 7) states, "All pages of each response shall be appropriately numbered (and with consecutive page numbering across tabs)." We will be submitting some pre-existing documents (e.g., financial reports) that have existing page numbering and some pages may not be numbered. Because these are long and complex documents, may we leave them unaltered?

    Answer: Yes.

25. Network Capability, Equipment, Service, and Supply Requirements (Page 27) states, "The Vendor shall supply the City with ten (10) Point of Sale (POS) cashier terminals that consist of ten (10) personal computers (PCs), monitors and associated equipment that makes up a workstation under the City IT Department's minimum hardware specifications." Please provide the City IT Department's minimum hardware specifications.

    Answer: We don't have minimum hardware specifications, per se, however we would require the following:
    - Latest Window 10 OS
    - Ability to install antivirus software. Any folders to be eliminated from virus checking should be specified.
    - Ability to install event logging software

26. Production Schedules (Page 31) states, "Development schedule associated with the required customization of the enforcement application to get in line with the City's desired business processes." Please define the business process for the required customization for the enforcement application.

    Answer: Guest passes – Guest passes will need to be monitored to detect abuse by plate number and followed up with the enforcement of the City's rules.

    Overtime parking- The handhelds must have the ability to mark stem to have the ability to issue citations if in violation of the City's rules.

27. Enforcement Capabilities (Page 24) states, "Individual charger cord for Bluetooth enabled mobile handheld ticket writing device and printers." Will the city require handheld chargers for officers' cars as well as for at-home? Today, this is supported and provided to the city.

Answer:  At this time we have both provided by the Vendor and would expect the same to continue.

28. Collection Agency Services (Page 35) states, "The Vendor shall provide collection agency services as requested by the City." Does the city require the same standards for collections they have done in the past? Collections were broken out by Out of state, In State and Somerville only, as the three populations. There was also a criterion of number of days before the notice could be sent out. Please define these rules, or if there is an opportunity to collect all outstanding debt?

    Answer:  Same standard we have at this point. It may not be possible for the city to collect all outstanding debt but the city will work closely with the vendor and the collection agency for debt collection.

29. Supplies and Materials (Page 26) states, "The Vendor must provide handheld machine ticket stock that is the equivalent of 300,000 tickets each year." Current run rates are under 150,000 per year for tickets. Would the city like to pare down the 300,000 number in this section, which would reduce the cost for both envelopes and tickets stock?

    Answer: We would like to stick with the 300K as requested.

30. Credit/Debit Card Processing (Page 13) states, "The City requires that the Vendor passes on all credit/debit card transaction convenience fees to the customer dictated by the City's contract with Invoice Cloud as its credit card processor. The City reserves the right to opt to absorb these fees at its own discretion." With the City having its independent contract with Invoice Cloud under which Invoice Cloud is the merchant of record, can the City please confirm that bidders may not assess a credit card convenience fee? This includes all payment methods that the successful vendor hosts (e.g. over the counter, pay-by-web, IVR, app, fleet portal, RPP online).

    Answer: "Passing credit/debit card transaction convenience fees to the customer" has not been implemented at this time and remain to be determined by the City. Invoice Cloud is the current merchant of record handling credit/debit card payments solely for meters and OTC tickets/permits but not for other payment methods such as pay-by-web, IVR, on-line RPP, etc.

31. Vendor Conduct (Page 67) states, "Vendors must be knowledgeable of the conflict-of-interest law found on the Commonwealth's website". To ensure a fair and competitive proposal process, can bidders assume that any firm(s) which were given an opportunity to review and comment on the draft RFP before it was officially released will be excluded from participating as bidders? "

    Answer: The RFP is open for any potential proposer to point out what they feel is unfair or proprietary and the City will take those suggestions into consideration. Prior to drafting this RFP, there may have been communications between the parking department and other potential vendors as market research, to understand what they offered in order to improve requirements and specifications. The City has a right to research and understand what is available in the industry and the market to further improve and upgrade specifications and requirements for an improvement to overall functionality and efficiency. Vendors may make suggestions but the City is ultimately the decision-maker on what it wants as long as it is not limiting proprietary specification."

**Addendum No. 3 to RFP 22-27**

**Appendix A:**
**Revised Quality Requirements Form**

# Revised Quality Requirements

Quality requirements, or basic business requirements, are the minimum set of standards that an entity must meet and certify to be considered responsible and responsive. **Please complete the Quality Requirements form, below, and submit it with your completed bid.** The City of Somerville will disqualify any response that does not meet the minimum quality requirements.  A "No Response" to items 1 - 54 or a failure to respond to any of the following minimum standards will result in disqualification of your bid.

| | QUALITY REQUIREMENTS | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Five (5) years or more of experience in providing similar Parking Violation Processing Services to municipalities? | | |
| 2. | Is your Firm capable of processing (please provide individual responses for each sub section): <br> a.     250,000 new citations per year? <br> b.     80,000 Lock Box Payments per year? <br> c.     80,000 on-line cashiering payments per year? <br> d.     10,000 automated phone payments per year? <br> e.     100,000 Internet payments per year, via cash, credit card and check? | | |
| 3. | Can you provide processing for (please provide individual responses for each sub section): <br> a.     Inquiry by ticket, name, plate, address, license number and permit number? <br> b.     On-line, real time cashiering, Monday thru Friday from 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM with an on-line response time of 3 seconds or less? <br> c.     On-line disputes? <br> d.     On-line scheduled hearings with audio and visual recordings? <br> e.     On line and email correspondence letters for hearings, bounced checks and overpayments as well as any future letters needed? <br> f.     180,000 online permits per year | | |
| 4. | Can you provide an online dispute option for violators to contest ticket via video-chat, video-conference, or other audio/visual connection? | | |
| 5. | Can you provide a direct line with RMV/DMV research, to support (please provide individual responses for the sub section): <br> a.     4,000 inquiries per week? <br> b.     2,000 non-renewal mail transactions per month? <br> c.     1,000 non-renewal clear transactions bi-weekly? <br> d.     Acquisition of name and address for tickets issued to out of state registrants? <br> e.     All types of Municipality state plates? <br> f.     Link plates for Municipality state swaps? <br> g.     Manually review and research violations with no plate match at the RMV? | | |
| 6. | Do you have the ability to provide a Performance Bond, for 100% of the annual Contract amount? | | |
| 7. | Are you capable of commencing all aspects of operations within 30 calendar days, after notice of award, with a parallel operation as required by the City? | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8. | Are you able to retrieve archived information within one week? | | |
| 9. | Are you able to provide back-up of all files? | | |
| 10. | Are you able to restore all files from back-up? | | |
| 11. | Can you provide lockbox processing to include payments updated to database within 48 hours of receipt? | | |
| 12. | Can you provide Data entry/processing to include ticket documentation, updated to database within 72 hours of receipt? | | |
| 13. | Can you provide a Lessor Noticing Program capable of inputting name/address provided by lessor? | | |
| 14. | Can you provide a website that is both desktop and 'mobile' enabled, complete with contemporary design and functionality; full integration with your ticket processing system, online payment and permitting system, online appeals, and traffic and email alerts? | | |
| 15. | Can you provide at least one (1) fully integrated Mobile License Plate Reader (LPR) technology system, and integrate in the future with remote vehicle immobilization (RVI) systems? | | |
| 16. | Can you provide all software items associated with implementing LPR and RVI systems? | | |
| 17. | Can you provide handheld enforcement terminals that interface with 3rd party vendors, including IPS single-space meters, Parkeon Technology multispace meters, and the Parkmobile and Paybyphone pay-by-phone systems? | | |
| 18. | Can you provide new computer terminals, printers, and payment receipting equipment as stated in Section I, Scope of Services?  (New Vendors) | | |
| 19. | Can you provide all telecommunication links? | | |
| 20. | Will you be able to provide service/access with the Massachusetts RMV? Nemlets? | | |
| 21. | Can you generate all reports listed in Appendix 9?  Are all the permits able to be downloaded into an excel format without additional formatting? In excel, CSV and Access formats? | | |
| 22. | Can you provide documented ability to provide a residential permit parking program that would (please provide individual responses for the sub section): <br>   a. Process 180,000 permits per year, via email, in-person and online? <br>   b. Inform all permit holders annually, on expiration dates of residential parking permits and visitor permits as determined by the City, via mail and email? <br>   c. Enable on-line permit issuance entry and change functions to include changing expiration dates for daily, weekly and monthly permits? <br>   d. Allow for renewal of residential permits, visitor permits, and all other permits by mail and email with appropriate renewal notices? <br>   e. Print Reports: <br>     o Cashiering Reports? <br>     o Renewal Reports? <br>     o Reports by GIS enabled Locations? | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23. | Can you provide documented ability to provide a residential permit parking program that would enable inquiry, using partial matching and/or "fuzzy word search" by at least six different options:<br>     o  Name?<br>     o  Registration Number?<br>     o  Address?<br>     o  Permit Number?<br>     o  Account Number?<br>     o  Guest Card Number? | | |
| 24. | Can you supply 250,000 computer tickets and 10,000 hand written tickets per year with a delivery of 10,000 tickets within five (5) working days? | | |
| 25. | Can you store physical ticket copies after entry for at least three months – copy to be deliverable upon request, within three (3) days? | | |
| 26. | Can you accommodate changes to fines as required by City Ordinance within thirty (30) days? | | |
| 27. | Can you provide training as outlined in the Scope of Services? | | |
| 28. | Can you document experience in providing electronic computer generated tickets and ticketing systems, including equipment that would integrate with the hand-written ticket system? | | |
| 29. | House an inventory of resident permit parking districts and regulated streets within each district? | | |
| 30. | Fully integrate with parking management system, enabling resolution of parking citations issued incorrectly to permit holders, or withhold of permit sales due to outstanding parking tickets? | | |
| 31. | Financial controls for tracking and reconciliation of fees collected, and inclusion of fees in a collections report? | | |
| 32. | Ability for users to perform all maintenance, updates and payments of Permits or tickets online? | | |
| 33. | Ability for users to inquire online using a variety of search parameters? | | |
| 34. | Ability to generate notices, and emails for use in renewal or informational mailings? | | |
| 35. | Integration with parking management system cashiering module, allowing outstanding balances for parking tickets and new permit sales? | | |
| 36. | Configurable to match existing permit data entry flow, for easy transition? | | |
| 37. | Interface with other online systems, such as department's website and any other payment providers? | | |
| 38. | Ability to assign/allocate multiple permits to single address? | | |
| 39. | Ability to assign multiple vehicles to single permit tag (carpools, multi-vehicle families)? | | |
| 40. | Allows permit types to be defined with flat-rate, prorated or tiered fee schedules? | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 41. | Integration of vehicle owner information into ticket issuance database? | | |
| 42. | The resident permit application must be capable of generating various mailings and merged with name and address file of system of record | | |
| 43. | Resident permit application must provide ability for applicants to register online as well as renew online, with appropriate controls to ensure any delinquencies of tickets are paid first | | |
| 44. | Management reports can be provided relating to functions as designated by the city? | | |
| 45. | The inquiry function allows for a search of permit data that updates in real time? | | |
| 46. | Permit system can accept new permits and interface with ticket system to inquire for delinquent tickets? | | |
| 47. | Permit system can allow user to issue or not issue (based upon supporting documentation) a new permit? | | |
| 48. 49. | Can you provide documented ability to process ticket payments via phone with credit card; and via internet with credit card and check? | | |
| 50. | Is your company able to provide all raw data created by your company to the City of Somerville, or the City's designees, on a monthly or quarterly basis? | | |
| 50. | Does your company have the ability to provide real-time, up-to-the-minute data to Somerville or its designees? | | |
| 51. | Will your company be able to update database, on a regular basis (at least monthly), to clean duplicate account records? | | |
| 52. | Will your company enable violators to pay their ticket using their mobile phone by utilizing a barcode scan or equivalent mobile payment technology? | | |
| 53. | If you are a company based outside of Massachusetts, will you be able to provide continuous service, according to the scope of services/specifications? | | |
| 54. | Will you comply with the City of Somerville's Living Wage Ordinance? | | |
| 55. | Optional: Are you a Mass. Supplier Diversity Office MBE/WBE certified minority or woman owned business? | | |

In order to provide verification of affirmative responses to items 1-54 under the quality requirements listed in the Quality Requirements Form, proposers must submit written information that details the general background, experience, and qualifications of the organization.  Subcontractors, if applicable, must be also included.

**Addendum No. 3 to RFP 22-27**

**Appendix B:**
**Revised Comparative Evaluation Criteria**

# Revises Comparative Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated by the Evaluation Committee appointed by the Purchasing Director using comparative criteria set forth as follows:

**Processing Capability:**

The Proposal shall provide all details regarding relevant experience and reputation with regards to: (a) effectiveness in violation processing, noticing and collections; (b) management information systems; (c) effectiveness in interfacing, retrieving and processing registrant data from motor vehicle agencies; (d) interfacing and processing non-renewal mark and clear transactions to motor vehicle agencies.

*The Proposer shall provide as evidence of interface capabilities with State Departments of Motor Vehicles:*

1. **Handling of Data Requests**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Highly Advantageous:** | Proposer has more than 5,000 registrant data requests made and received weekly. |
| **Advantageous:** | Proposer has between 4,001 - 5,000 registrant data requests made and received weekly. |
| **Not Advantageous:** | Proposer has between 3,000 - 4,000 registrant data requests made and received weekly. |

2. **Handling of Mark Transactions**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Highly Advantageous:** | Proposer has more than 3,001 mark transactions attempted and successfully completed monthly. |
| **Advantageous:** | Proposer has between 2,001 - 3,000 mark transactions attempted and successfully completed monthly. |
| **Not Advantageous:** | Proposer has between 1,000 - 2,000 mark transactions attempted and successfully completed monthly. |

3. **Handling of Clear Transactions**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Highly Advantageous:** | Proposer has more than 3,001 clear transactions attempted and successfully completed bi-weekly. |
| **Advantageous:** | Proposer has between 2,001 - 3,000 clear transactions attempted and successfully completed bi-weekly. |
| **Not Advantageous:** | Proposer has between 1,000 - 2,000 clear transactions attempted and successfully completed bi-weekly. |

4. **Documentation of annual processing (for at least two consecutive years) of newly issued violations:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Highly Advantageous:** | Proposer processing more than 250,000 newly issued violations. |
| **Advantageous:** | Proposer processing between 200,000 - 250,000 newly issued violations. |
| **Not Advantageous:** | Proposer processing between 150,000 - 200,000 newly issued violations. |

5. **Documented experience in implementing the automated marking and clearing procedures for license-registration non-renewals.**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Highly Advantageous:** | Proposer has more than four (4) years of experience implementing the automated marking and clearing procedures with the Registry. |
| **Advantageous:** | Proposer has between 3 – 4 years of experience implementing the automated marking and clearing procedures with the Registry. |
| **Not Advantageous:** | Proposer has between less than 3 years of experience implementing the automated marking and clearing procedures with the Registry. |

*Vendor must identify a designated Project Manager(s) for all aspects of the City of Somerville's contract:*

6. **Project Manager with ticket processing experience:**

| Highly Advantageous: | Proposer has identified a project manager with more than three (3) years of ticket processing experience. |
|---|---|
| Advantageous: | Proposer has identified a project manager with between 2 -3 years of ticket processing experience. |
| Not Advantageous: | Proposer has identified a project manager with less than 2 years of ticket processing experience. |

7. **Project Manager with residential parking program experience:**

| Highly Advantageous: | Proposer has identified a project manager with more than three (3) years of residential parking program experience. |
|---|---|
| Advantageous: | Proposer has identified a project manager with between 2 -3 years of residential parking program experience. |
| Not Advantageous: | Proposer has identified a project manager with between less than 2 years of residential parking program experience. |

8. **Documented ability to provide a Residential Permit Parking Program.**

| Highly Advantageous: | Proposer has provided documentation of 3 – 5 years of experience providing a Residential Permit Parking Program. |
|---|---|
| Advantageous: | Proposer has provided documentation of 1 -2 years of experience providing a Residential Permit Parking Program. |
| Not Advantageous: | Proposer has provided that a software program is available for a Residential Permit Parking Program. |

*Please provide references to support the information provided in these following comparative evaluation criteria:*

9. **Proposer's References**

| Highly Advantageous: | Received a highly advantageous rating after averaging all municipal references |
|---|---|
| Advantageous: | Received an advantageous rating after averaging all municipal references |
| Not Advantageous: | Received a not advantageous rating after averaging all municipal references |

10. **Sample Reports**

| Highly Advantageous: | Proposer's reports provide all the necessary information and is very easy for Management & Staff to read & interpret |
|---|---|
| Advantageous: | Proposer's reports provide all the necessary information and is adequately easy for Management & Staff to read & interpret. |
| Not Advantageous: | Proposer's reports provided are not easy for Management & Staff to read & interpret. |

11. **Reports**

| Highly Advantageous: | Proposer's reports can be programmed on a recurring schedule, and allows City to run reports after selecting criteria to create specific, customized queries in an excel format without assistance from the Vendor from the Permit/Ticketing data base. |
|---|---|
| Advantageous: | Proposer provides reports and sends it as an excel data base. |
| Not Advantageous: | Proposer's reports must be created by the Vendor and are in Crystal Report format |

## 12. Mobile Application

| | |
|---|---|
| **Highly Advantageous:** | Proposer has a user friendly mobile application for meter payments, ticket payments, and permit payments. |
| **Advantageous:** | Proposer has a mobile application for ticket and permit payments. |
| **Not Advantageous:** | Proposer does not have a mobile application for any payments |