



Date: 3/25/2026
To: Prospective Bidders
Subject: Addendum No. 1
General Questions and Answers

This addendum forms part of the bidding and contract documents and modifies the original bidding documents dated 3/4/2026. Acknowledge receipt of this addendum in the space provided below. FAILURE TO DO SO WILL SUBJECT BIDDER TO DISQUALIFICATION.

1. Will the awarded vendor be responsible for the initial physical installation of new signage and ongoing sign maintenance, or will the city handle physical installation of signs once the vendor provides the signs?

Answer: Proposer will be responsible for the initial physical installation of new signage and ongoing maintenance. The City is open to handling a portion of installation.

2. What is COG's annual volume of mobile transactions?

Answer: Refer to Exhibit D of the RFP

3. What is the average transaction value for mobile payments?

Answer: Approximately \$5.00

4. Is the vendor responsible for installing signs?

Answer: Yes

5. Will COG accept an additional, redacted copy of the proposal in the event of a future FOIA request?

Answer: No

6. Item 6 of the Scope of Work states "Customer service hotline should be available to users 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with a live representative available Monday through Sunday, 9AM-6PM." Is COG referring to End User Support, or COG Support?

Answer: End-User Support



7. Section 8.B (Submittal Packet - Required Contents), Page 29.
The RFP states that "submittals must include the package in its entirety." Does the City require the full 42-page original RFP document to be included within the electronic submittal, or does "package" refer specifically to the 12 items listed in the "Proposal Submittal Order" found in Section 8.1?

Answer: Refer to Section 8.1, Proposal Submittal Order

8. Section 1 (Key Events Schedule), Page 2; Section 3 (Scope of Work), Page 12.
Given the mandatory July 1, 2026, go-live date, what is the City's anticipated "Notice to Proceed" or contract execution date? This information is necessary to ensure the proposed implementation and testing schedule is accurate and achievable.

Answer: Refer to Section 3.2, Timeline

9. Section 6.1.2 (Proposer's Questionnaire), Page 15.
This section requests financial statements for the past two fiscal years. For privately held firms, will the City accept an Independent Auditor's Report or a formal letter from a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) attesting to the firm's financial stability and liquidity in the initial submission, with the understanding that full financial statements can be provided upon shortlisting or under a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA)?

Answer: Yes

10. Concurrent Multi-Vehicle Sessions:
What is the intended scope and use case for the requirement to support concurrent multi-vehicle parking sessions? Specifically, does the City expect users to be able to pay for parking for multiple vehicles at the same time outside of permit parking, and if so, what is the expected workflow?

Answer: COG expects that the mobile parking payment system will allow a user to pay for parking for multiple vehicles during the same/overlapping parking session times. The Annual Permit authorized for the Seawall can only be used for one vehicle. The user would be able to utilize the Annual Permit for the one vehicle and pay for parking for another vehicle(s) during the same/overlapping parking session times.

11. Digital vs. Metered Transactions:
Can the City provide a breakdown of digital payment transactions versus physical meter transactions within the reported 2025 total of 604,885 parking transactions?

Answer: The 604,885 transactions for 2025 only include mobile parking payment system transactions.



12. Award and Implementation Timeline:

If the City intends for the new system to go live by July 1, 2026, what is the anticipated contract award date, and how much implementation time will be provided to the selected vendor prior to go-live? Are there any scenarios where the City might extend the go-live date to allow more time for a seamless delivery?

Answer: Anticipated award contract is May 2026. The City intends to be live on July 1, 2026 with a mobile parking payment system. If a new system is selected, the complete transition period will be no longer than 90 days.

13. Annual Passes vs. Digital Permits:

Does the City consider annual “parking passes” (such as Seawall annual passes) functionally equivalent to digital permits, and should vendors price digital permits as an additional module or add-on service separate from the core mobile parking payment system?

Answer: The City does consider the Annual Permit authorized for the Seawall only to be the functional equivalent of a “digital permit”. The COG is not providing direction on how the vendor should price items in their proposal.

14. Digital Permits & Enforcement:

Should vendors assume all future annual passes and permits will be digital and enforced via LPR (license plate recognition) or will any physical or hangtag permits be required.

Answer: Physical or hanging permits will not be required.

15. Preferred Pricing Model:

Does the City have a preference for a transactional (per-use) pricing model, a licensing (subscription) model, or a combination of both for the Mobile Parking Payment System?

Answer: Transactional (per use) pricing model.

16. Enforcement Hardware Integration:

Which enforcement hardware provider(s) must the selected vendor integrate with for LPR and citation issuance? Is all enforcement hardware provided by GTechna, or are other vendors involved?

Answer: The selected vendor must integrate with Gtechna.



17. Signage Design and Installation:

Does the City prefer that the vendor both design and install all required signage, or is the City open to a solution where the vendor provides design and fabrication only, with the City handling installation?

Answer: The proposer will be responsible for the initial physical installation of new signage and ongoing maintenance. The City is open to City handling a portion of installation.

18. Preferred Installers for Signage:

If signage installation is the vendor's responsibility, does the City have a list of approved or preferred installation contractors that the vendor should consider for subcontracting.

Answer: The City does not have a list of approved or preferred installation contractors.

19. Merchant of Record and Payment Processing:

As the City prefers to remain Merchant of Record, can you describe the ideal transaction handling process? For example, should the vendor process the transaction and have the gateway push funds directly to a City-owned bank account? If so, what is the City's preferred gateway provider, Merchant ID issuer, and bank account for deposits?

Answer: The vendor should process the transaction and have the gateway provider of their choice push funds through the City's Merchant Id Issuer, Fiserv.

20. Mobile Payment Vendor Strategy:

Can the City elaborate on whether they plan to replace the current mobile payment vendor entirely or if they are considering a multi-vendor mobile payments environment going forward?

Answer: The City intends to award one vendor, but reserves the right to award multiple vendors.

21. Will the City require migration of any historical parking session or permit data from the current provider into the new system? If so, what is the anticipated data volume and format?

Answer: Yes, To be determined.

22. SSO (Single Sign-On) Details:

For SSO integration, can the City confirm that Microsoft Entra (Azure Active Directory) will be used, and will technical documentation and access be provided to facilitate a timely integration?

Answer: Yes



23. System Acceptance Testing and Training:
What is the City's process and timeline for system acceptance testing, user training, and final signoff prior to go-live?

Answer: Anticipated award contract is May 2026. The City intends to be live on July 1, 2026 with a mobile parking payment system. If a new system is selected, the complete transition period will be no longer than 90 days.

24. Is PayByPhone the COG's only existing Mobile Payment Provider?

Answer: Yes

25. What pay station vendor is the COG currently using?

Answer: Arrive

26. What is the current convenience fee charged by the COG, for mobile payment transactions?

Answer: On February 26, 2026, City Council approved amending Sec. 34-117(c) Downtown Paid Parking District and Sec. 340117(d) UTMB Parking Area, which went into effect March 23, 2026. Any applicable transaction fees will be applied in addition to the parking rate and will no longer be absorbed by the COG.

27. Is the COG planning to absorb transaction fees or will those be passed to the parker?

Answer: Effective March 23, 2026, the COG will no longer absorb the transaction fee.

28. Is the COG planning to absorb credit card processing fees or will those be passed to the parker?

Answer: The COG will absorb the credit card processing fees.

29. Is the COG mandating that it must be the merchant of record, or would it consider alternatives if they reduce fees or risk?

Answer: The COG prefers to be the merchant of record and will consider alternatives.

30. Can the COG please clarify its expectations related to merchant of record responsibilities and the associated payment processor requirements?



Answer: The goal of the COG is to manage the overall cost and ensure the cost is the lowest available rate in current and future contracts. By the COG acting as its own merchant of record, this allows the city to negotiate the lowest possible rate.

31. Can the COG please clarify which merchant processor is currently in use?

Answer: Fiserv

32. Can the COG please clarify which payment processor is currently in use?

Answer: Fiserv

33. Can the COG clarify if the 1-800 payment option mentioned in the documentation refers to an IVR (Interactive Voice Response) payment system?

Answer: The 1-800 payment option is not limited to the IVR (Interactive Voice Response).

34. Please clarify if the COG expects text-to-pay and scan-to-pay payment methods to be included as required components of the proposed mobile payment solution.

Answer: COG does not expect text-to-pay and scan-to-pay payment methods to be required components of the proposed mobile payment solution.

35. Does the COG anticipate any future changes to the current rate structure?

Answer: Future changes to the current rate structure should always be anticipated.

36. What LPR platform(s) does the COG currently use?

Answer: ELSAG M7 Mobile LPR

37. Can COG please confirm if the GTechna platform is currently utilized for permit management as well as for enforcement and citation management? If not, what platform is COG currently utilizing for enforcement and permit management?

Answer: Gtechna is currently utilized for enforcement and citation management. Gtechna is not used for permit management. As relates to this RFP, the only permit is an Annual Permit for parking on the Seawall. This is a permit authorized through the Proposition A Election held on May 4, 2019. The Annual Permit is purchased through the current vendor, PayByPhone and managed by the COG.



38. Does the COG have a preferred signage vendor for printing, removal and installation?

Answer: No

39. Does the COG require any custom reports beyond those listed (e.g., revenue breakdown, zone-by-zone analytics, annual pass utilization)?

Answer: COG does not require any custom reports beyond those listed.

40. What are all the current categories of parking permits currently being issued and managed by the COG? Does the COG anticipate adding any new parking permit categories?

Answer: As relates to this RFP, the only permit is an Annual Permit for parking on the Seawall. This is a permit authorized through the Proposition A Election held on May 4, 2019. The Annual Permit is purchased through the current vendor, PayByPhone and managed by the COG. Future additions to the parking permit categories should always be anticipated.

41. How are each category of parking passes currently being issued and managed by the COG?

Answer: The annual permit for the Seawall can also be considered a parking pass and is authorized through the Proposition A Election held on May 4, 2019. The annual permit is purchased through the current vendor, PayByPhone, and managed by the COG.

42. Can the COG clarify whether all categories of parking permits are automatically renewed or if renewals require a new application and review process?

Answer: The Annual Permit is authorized for the Seawall only and requires renewal annually. Renewal is not automatic; there is no application or review process. The Annual Permit is a purchase option in the current mobile parking payment system.

43. Does the COG require digital permits, physical decals, or both?

Answer: COG does not require physical decals. The purchase of the annual permits for the Seawall only could be considered the functional equivalent of a digital permit.



44. In Section 1, 1.2, COG states, "COG reserves the right to award multiple Agreements as a result of this RFP if deemed in the best interest of COG." What is the maximum amount of vendors COG may be looking to award to?

Answer: COG intends to award one vendor, but reserves the right to award to multiple vendors.

45. Regarding oral presentations, please confirm:

a. What are the key criteria COG will use to evaluate presentations?

Answer: Refer to Section 2.2 of the RFP

b. The expectations around presentations (i.e., how much time presenters will have, what the agenda will be, etc.)?

Answer: To be determined

46.. Regarding the evaluation team mentioned in line item 5 of Section 2, 2.2, could COG please clarify which members of the evaluation team will be grading which sections of the proposal, or if each member will be grading proposals in their entirety?

Answer: Each member will be grading proposals in their entirety.

47. In line item 21 of the "Major Functions to be Followed," section of Section 3 – Scope of Work, COG mentions an "Integration with existing and future paid parking management, license plate readers, and enforcement systems shall be provided at no additional cost." Other than gtechna, is the City able to elaborate on who those vendors might be?

Answer: There are no other vendors at this time.

48. Are there any other not currently implemented vendors anticipated to be introduced to COG's paid parking operation?

Answer: No

49. In the instructions for the Proposer's Questionnaire, COG states, "Proposer should reference the item number and repeat the question in its response" Please confirm if line item 3.1.4 within 6.1 – Proposer Profile should be treated as 6.1.4.

Answer: Yes

a. Similarly, please confirm is 3.4.5 within 6.3 – General Requirements, should be treated as 3.3.5.

Answer: Yes



50. In the “Major Functions to be Followed” section, COG states: “The City must approve the transaction fee, or any other fee assessed to customers using the Mobile Parking Payment System prior to it being assessed for transactions.” Could we confirm that the City does anticipate to pass the transaction fee off to the customer?

Answer: Yes

51. Would the City be open to receiving a bespoke cover letter within submissions?

Answer: Yes

52. Regarding Section 6.2.1 (Approach to Project Services), can the City clarify whether proposers are required to respond individually to each requirement listed in Section 3 (e.g., all items under ‘Major Functions to be Followed,’ as well as ‘Reports to be Issued’ and ‘System Management by an External Provider’), or if a consolidated narrative response is preferred?

Answer: Respond individually to each requirement.

53. To support a well-structured and responsive proposal, can the City clarify whether specific sections or questions in the RFP correspond to each evaluation category (Work Plan, Cost Proposal, Qualifications & Experience, Financial Stability, etc.)? If available, a mapping or guidance would help ensure appropriate emphasis and organization.

Answer: Mapping and guidance for this question is not available.

54. Can the City clarify what specific elements contribute to the ‘Completeness/Organization’ score (e.g., adherence to format, cross-referencing, conciseness, ease of navigation)?

Answer: Refer to Section 2.2, Criteria for Selection

55. Could proponents include a list of standard pricing alongside Section 4 – Pricing Proposal?

Answer: Yes, however, the Pricing Proposal in Section 4.1 should reflect all costs.

56. How will the Cost Proposal (35%) be evaluated (e.g., lowest cost, best value, cost realism, or a formula-based scoring approach)?

Answer: The overall cost of doing business with the city.



57. How will optional services, value-added features, or alternative pricing components be considered in the evaluation?

Answer: Refer to Section 2.2, Criteria for Selection.

58. Beyond the stated criteria, are there specific priorities or outcomes the City considers most critical in determining 'best value'?

Answer: Refer to Section 2.2, Criteria for Selection.

59. To what extent will proposed exceptions or redlines to the sample Agreement impact a proposer's evaluation or ranking?

Answer: To be determined

60. How does the City intend to utilize parking transaction and user behavior data beyond standard operational reporting (e.g., for planning, forecasting, economic analysis, or continuous decision support)?

Answer: City is not limiting the utilization of parking transactions and user behavior data.

61. Does the City expect the system to function as a real-time decision-support platform with continuous visibility into parking demand, usage patterns, and system performance?

Answer: Yes

62. Does the City have interest in incorporating predictive analytics such as demand forecasting, peak usage modeling, violation prediction, or revenue optimization into the system?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services

63. Is the City interested in implementing geospatial intelligence capabilities such as geofencing, dynamic zoning, occupancy heatmaps, or demand-based pricing models?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services

64. Does the City plan to analyze user behavior patterns (e.g., dwell time, turnover, repeat usage, congestion drivers, mobility flows) to inform parking policy, enforcement, or pricing strategies?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services



65. Are there plans to integrate parking data with other City datasets (e.g., tourism, traffic, events, mobility, or economic development data) for broader analysis and visualization?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services

66. Would the City benefit from real-time dashboards with actionable insights, including congestion alerts, enforcement prioritization, anomaly detection, and performance tracking?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services

67. How open is the City to incorporating innovative features such as AI-driven recommendations, smart/dynamic pricing, and automated decision-support capabilities during the contract term?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services

68. Should the system provide automated, data-driven recommendations for pricing, Enforcement prioritization, and operational optimization?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services

69. Will dynamic or demand-based pricing be implemented, and how frequently are pricing policies expected to be adjusted (e.g., threshold-based or scheduled updates)?

Answer: Pricing policies are set by City Council and/or ballot propositions.

70. What key performance indicators (KPIs) will the City use to evaluate the success of the Mobile Parking Payment System (e.g., revenue, compliance, adoption, utilization)?

Answer: KPI's will be determined during implementation of the awarded system.

71. Can the City clarify expectations regarding data ownership, access rights, and the use of anonymized data for analytics purposes?

Answer: COG will have ownership of the data. COG will determine access rights.

72. Are there plans to expand the system in the future (e.g., additional zones, permits, EV integration, or broader smart mobility initiatives)?

Answer: Not at this time

73. Does the City have interest in capturing user feedback, sentiment, and friction points to improve the parking experience and public perception?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services



74. Is the City interested in segmenting users (e.g., residents, visitors, commuters, underserved populations) to support targeted communication, pricing strategies, and equitable access?

Answer: Refer to 6.6 Additional Services

75. How does the City plan to ensure accessibility and equitable access (e.g., unbanked users, language support, ADA/WCAG compliance, offline functionality)?

Answer: Proposer to ensure accessibility and equitable access in compliance with WGAC 2.1.

76. Does the City plan to conduct user adoption or awareness campaigns, and would performance tracking and feedback loops for continuous improvement be required?

Answer: COG will conduct awareness campaigns. Refer to Section 3.2

77. What challenges has the City experienced with the current Mobile Parking Payment System, and are there any constraints related to transitioning from legacy systems?

Answer: None, No

78. Will historical parking and transaction data from the current system be made available for migration, benchmarking, and analysis?

Answer: Yes

79. Is the City open to a pilot or phased rollout approach, and how will success be measured (e.g., before/after performance metrics)?

Answer: Refer to Section 3.2, Timeline

80. Beyond the systems listed in the RFP, are there additional platforms or technologies the solution should integrate with (e.g., GIS, enforcement, financial systems, or smart city platforms)?

Answer: No

81. Does the City have preferred standards or architecture for data interoperability, API-first design, or real-time multi-source data ingestion?

Answer: Data must be available in real time, but City does not have a preferred standard.



82. Should the system support real-time validation and monitoring capabilities (e.g., availability, signage, infrastructure, or field-based observations)?

Answer: Yes.

83. Does the City allow or encourage the use of subcontractors for specialized services such as analytics, geospatial intelligence, field data collection, or AI capabilities?

Answer: Yes

84. What is the approval process for subcontractors, and are there any limitations on the scope of work that may be subcontracted?

Answer: Must be approved by City on a case-by-case basis

85. Are there specific participation goals or incentives for M/WBE or DBE subcontractors for this project?

Answer: No

86. Would the City consider a multi-vendor approach where a primary contractor partners with specialized firms to enhance system capabilities?

Answer: Must be approved by City on a case-by-case basis, must integrate with each other.

87. How does the City allocate responsibility and liability between prime contractors and subcontractors?

Answer: Responsibility is with the primary contractor

88. Does the City have a preferred pricing structure (e.g., subscription-based, transaction-based, hybrid, or performance-based)?

Answer: Transaction Based

89. How will the City evaluate value-added services (e.g., advanced analytics, AI capabilities, realtime intelligence) that go beyond the minimum requirements outlined in the RFP?

Answer: To Be Determined



CITY OF GALVESTON – RFP # 26-09
ADDENDUM 1
Mobile Parking Payment System

I hereby certify receipt of this addendum and have incorporated its information or changes in preparation of my submittal.

Authorized Signature

Date

Printed Name

Company Name

A COPY OF THE ADDENDUM MUST BE SIGNED AND RETURNED WITH YOUR BID