



Finance

Purchasing Division
929 North Front
Street, 10th Floor
P O Box 1810
Wilmington, NC 28402-1810

910 341-7830
910 341-7842 fax
wilmingtonnc.gov
Dial 711
TTY/Voice

ADDENDUM NUMBER 2
PARKING MANAGEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT
SOLUTIONS
RFP-S1-0826.2

September 17, 2026

To all holders of RFP -S1-0826.2 Proposal Documents:

This addendum forms part of the Proposal documents and modifies the original proposal document. Deletions, corrections, and changes shall be as binding as if incorporated in the original documents. All General Overviews, Terms and Conditions, basic requirements, etc., as specified initially, shall apply to these items. Acknowledging receipt of this addendum will be required as part of the contract agreement.

Item #1: Attached are the questions and responses for this project.

Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in the space provided in the Proposal. Failure to do so may disqualify the Proposer.

Ariental Fullwood, Buyer
Purchasing Division
END OF ADDENDUM ONE

Addendum 2
Page 1 of 1

ADDENDUM NUMBER 2

RFP-S1-0826.2 – Parking Management And Enforcement Solutions

DATE: September 17, 2026

To all holders of bid documents: Please be advised of the following:

Question/ Note (To be Advised of any Changes)		
	Question	Response
1.	The Affidavit and Certificate of Non-Collusion, Non-Suspension, and Non-Conviction requests a signature from specific corporate titles, including Vice President or Corporate President. ZipBy's corporate structure does not include these titles. Could you please confirm whether this document may instead be signed by our Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or just the Owner, who holds equivalent signing and binding authority on behalf of the company?	This form can be signed by an authorized corporate officer, general partner, owner, or legally designated agent who has the authority to bind the company and make decisions regarding pricing.
2.	Can the City confirm the intended garage sequence beyond Skyline (Phase 1)? Is Convention Center or River Place next, and is that order fixed or open to vendor recommendation?	City is open to discussing the order pending vendor solution performance of phase 1 and proposed solution for the next garage. Each garage has different users and their own unique challenges.
3.	The RFP notes Skyline has no on-site network access. Can the City confirm current cellular/LTE signal strength or connectivity infrastructure at Skyline to inform equipment specifications (e.g., digital signage, sensors)?	Unable to perform that test. However, many mobile payments are made in that garage.
4.	Will the City require full replacement of the current TEZ mobile payment experience at Skyline, or is integration/coexistence with TEZ acceptable during transition?	Not required. Current integration is acceptable.

5.	How are Skyline's IPS/Genetec LPR enforcement data currently structured, and would the City permit direct API access/integration for a new vendor's platform?	Currently not integrated with Genetec.
6.	Can the City confirm whether "dynamic wayfinding" signage is required starting in Phase 1 (Skyline), or is it scoped to begin at a later phase/location?	Assuming this is the off-site sign. Can be added in later phases. Not required in phase 1.
7.	Are there existing utility/power drops at proposed off-site signage locations, or should vendors assume new electrical work is required?	Uncertain. But plan on power extension.
8.	What are the City's current credit card processing fees applicable to parking transactions (e.g., percentage rate plus any fixed per-transaction fee), and which processor(s)/gateway(s) are currently in use for transient and permit payments?	City does not pay these fees. All fees passed on to consumers. Parking permits are processed manually.
9.	What convenience and/or service fees, if any, are currently charged to parkers on mobile or in-lane transactions, and are those fees currently retained by the City, retained by the incumbent payment provider, or passed through in full to the user?	City does not have this service in the gated garages.
10.	Can the City provide current parking rates by facility and rate type (hourly, daily maximum, event-day, reserved), as well as current monthly/permit fees by garage?	Skyline Daily Rates • Up to 1 hour: \$1 • Up to 2 hours: \$3 • Up to 3 hours: \$6 • 3 to 12 hours: \$9 • 12 to 24 hours: \$15 Max • Nightly single space rate: \$10, Thursday - Saturday (9 p.m. to 2 a.m.) • Decks charge 24 hours/day, 7 days/week • Card Replacement: \$15



	• Lost Ticket: \$14 • Reactivation Fee: \$25 (returned check or non-payment) Monthly Rates • Unreserved: \$100 • Reserved: \$175 Special Event Rate • \$10 flat rate, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. (small events, non-concert rate) • \$20 flat rate Convention Center Daily Rates • Up to 1 hour: \$3 • Up to 2 hours: \$5 • Up to 3 hours: \$7 • Up to 4 hours: \$9 • 4 to 12 hours: \$11 • 12 to 24 hours: \$15 max • Wilmington Convention Center parking deck charges 24/7, unless otherwise posted • Credit card payment only when exit booth is unattended (pay station at exit does not accept cash) Monthly Rates • Unreserved: \$100 • Reserved Rate: \$130 • Card Replacement Fee: \$15
--	---



	• Card Reactivation Fee: \$5 (returned checks or non-payment) Special Event Rate • Short Term (up to 3 hours): \$5* • Partial Day (up to 8 hours): \$10* • All Day (up to 24 hours): \$20* * Rate will be posted on day of event River Place Daily Rates • Up to 1 hour: \$2 • Up to 2 hours: \$4 • Up to 3 hours: \$6 • 3 to 12 hours: \$10 • 12 to 24 hours: \$15 Max • Lost Ticket Fee: \$15 • Card Replacement Fee: \$15 • Reactivation Fee: \$25 (returned check or non-payment) • \$10 nightly single space rate, Thursday - Saturday (9 p.m. to 2 a.m.) Monthly Rates • Unreserved: \$120 • Reserved: \$175 Special Event Rate • \$10 per day (7 a.m. to 7 p.m.) 2nd Street Daily Rates • Up to 1 Hour: Free
--	--



	• Up to 2 hours: \$3 • Up to 3 hours: \$4 • Up to 4 hours: \$5 • Up to 5 hours: \$7 • 5 - 12 Hours: \$10 • 12 - 24 Hours: \$15 max • Nightly single space rate: \$10 (Thursday - Saturday, 9 p.m. to 2 a.m.) • Lost Ticket Fee: \$14 • Decks operate 24 hours/day, 7 days/week Monthly Rates • Unreserved: \$90 • Unreserved Daytime: \$50 (Restricted to Monday - Friday; 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.) • Unreserved Evening & Weekend: \$40 (Restricted to Monday - Friday, 5 p.m. to 8 a.m.; and all day Saturday/Sunday) • Rooftop: \$25 • Reserved space: \$140 • Card Replacement Fee \$15 • Card Reactivation Fee: \$25 (due to returned checks or non-payment) Special Event Rate • \$15 flat rate (7 a.m. to 7 p.m.) Market Street Daily Rates • Up to 1 Hour: \$0 • Up to 2 hours: \$3
--	---



		• Up to 3 hours: \$4 • Up to 4 hours: \$5 • Up to 5 hours: \$7 • 5 - 12 Hours: \$10 • 12 - 24 Hours: \$15 Max • Evening Flat Rate: \$10 (Thursday-Saturday, 9 p.m. to 2 a.m.) • Lost Ticket Fee: \$14 • Decks charge 24 hours/day, 7 days/week Monthly Rates • Unreserved: \$90 • Unreserved Daytime: \$50 (Restricted to Monday - Friday 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.) • Unreserved Evening & Weekend: \$40 (Restricted to Monday - Friday; 5 pm. to 8 a.m.; and all day Saturday/Sunday) • Rooftop: \$25 • Reserved space: \$140 • Card Replacement Fee \$15 • Card Reactivation Fee: \$25 (returned check or non-payment) Special Event Rate • \$15 per day (7 a.m. - 7 p.m.)
11.	What is the City's current annual mobile payment revenue, and can this be broken out by facility (or by provider, e.g., PayByPhone vs. TEZ) if available?	Mobile payments not provided in the garages.
12.	What is the City's current annual permit revenue, broken down by permit type (e.g., monthly, reserved, residential, hotel/validation)?	\$3M for monthly parking including residential

13.	The RFP indicates the City will not serve as Merchant of Record. Can the City confirm this is a firm requirement for all payment types under this RFP (transient, permit, and event), and identify the City's current merchant account and/or payment gateway relationship, so vendors can address settlement and integration compatibility in their response?	Confirmed. City currently has no payment processor relationship.
14.	Does the City have a required or preferred convenience-fee structure (e.g., flat fee, percentage, or fees absorbed into the base parking rate), or is fee structure left to vendor recommendation, subject to City approval?	Flat fee
15.	Is there an established capital and/or annual operating budget range either citywide or per priority phase (Skyline Garage first, followed by Convention Center/River Place, then 2nd Street/Hannah, then Market Street/2nd Street Garage) that vendors should be aware of when structuring phased pricing?	A budget range has not been established. Pricing may vary based on proposed solution.
16.	Since the City may elect to install the system at a single garage or multiple garages depending on cost, should the Cost Proposal be structured as pricing per garage/phase, a single system-wide price, or both?	See page 14 of the RFP for pricing structure and formatting. Formatting is too complicated for this format to include.
17.	Does the City currently operate any fixed License Plate Recognition (LPR) cameras for enforcement at any garage, surface lot, or on-street location? If so, who is the current provider, and does the City intend to retain, replace, or integrate with that system under this RFP?	No.

18.	The RFP references an overall license plate read accuracy requirement of 98% or greater in the Camera LPR and General System Features sections. Can the City confirm this is the single governing accuracy standard the proposal will be evaluated against, as we noted a differing figure referenced elsewhere in the RFP?	Confirmed.
19.	Is there a named or preferred vendor for vehicle immobilization/boot services under Section I, or should vendors identify and propose their own partner?	Vendor should seek out their own partner.
20.	For camera and/or sensor deployments, does the City have a target number or preferred density of capture points per garage (e.g., per entry/exit lane, per deck level), or is that left fully to vendor design following the pre-bid site assessment?	No. Prefer vendor's proposed solution on placement and technology type.
21.	The RFP allows multiple technology/service providers to be included under a single prime vendor. Does the City have a specific requirement or target for the number of mobile payment provider options available to parkers alongside the incumbent PayByPhone and TEZ, or is that number left to vendor recommendation?	No. Preference is to work with current providers if possible.
22.	Beyond the single off-site occupancy sign requested for the initial project, can the City provide an estimated total number of on-site facility signs anticipated across the five garages (e.g., one per facility entrance, or multiple per facility/level)?	One per facility entrance.

23.	Does the City have a preferred or previously used signage manufacturer or installer, or any existing signage assets (poles, monument bases, electrical drops) that vendors should plan to reuse rather than build new?	No. vendor to choose.
24.	For off-site occupancy signage, given the RFP's note of "limited access to electrical utilities," can the City identify candidate off-site sign locations and their power/connectivity status in advance, or should vendors assume solar-, battery-, or cellular-powered signage in their pricing?	Not at this time. But power exists at each entrance that powers PARCS, gates, and security cameras.
25.	Can the City provide an estimate number of signs?	6
26.	Could the City confirm which parking systems (e.g. Park Chirp, ParkWhiz, Genetec, IPS) the mobile payment component of the proposed solution is expected to integrate with directly, as opposed to integrations that will be managed by the primary vendor?	The primary vendor is responsible for coordination all integrations.
27.	Could the City please provide a copy of the formula or methodology that will be used to evaluate the Price of proposed services (20 points) under the Evaluation Process?	There is no formula. Rating is based on vendors proposed solution to the RFP.
28.	Section H.8 requires the system to be "capable of producing physical signs that can accept tap to pay and eWallet payments." Could the City confirm whether NFC tap-to-pay signage is a mandatory requirement for all payment providers included in the response, or if this requirement may be satisfied by another component of the proposed solution?	Confirmed. Contactless payment is required.

29.	Section H.7 requires the system to be "capable of accepting in-lane eWallet transactions in gated mode." Could the City confirm whether this capability is expected to be provided by the mobile payment platform, the PARCS/gate hardware, or either, and whether the existing PARCS hardware is expected to support this without additional in-lane hardware changes?	eWallet is required for all payments for either hardware or digital payments.
30.	Project Scope: Please confirm whether proposers are required to provide a complete technical solution and pricing for all identified facilities, even though the City may elect to deploy the solution initially at Skyline Garage only.	Confirmed. Required for contract signing.
31.	Future Locations: If the City elects to deploy additional locations after Skyline Garage, will those deployments be authorized under the resulting contract without requiring a new competitive procurement?	No
32.	Implementation Schedule: Please provide the City's desired or required timeline from Notice to Proceed through go-live for the Skyline Garage implementation.	The City desires a process that is six months or less.
33.	Existing System Integrations: Please identify which existing systems—TIBA Spark, IPS, Genetec, TEZ, PayByPhone, ParkWhiz, ParkChirp and Flowbird—require integration as part of the initial Skyline deployment versus future facility deployments.	TEZ, Parkwhiz, and ParkChirp.
34.	Third-Party API Access: Will the City provide or facilitate all required API access, technical documentation, credentials, sandbox/test environments, and technical contacts for City-contracted third-party systems required for integration?	Yes. City will assist as needed.
35.	Third-Party Integration Costs: If an existing City technology provider charges API, development, licensing, certification, professional service, or recurring integration fees, should those costs be included in the proposer's pricing, or will the City contract with and pay those providers directly?	Include in proposal pricing.

36.	Third-Party Cooperation: If an incumbent City provider cannot or will not provide the access, API functionality, data, or cooperation necessary to satisfy an integration requirement, will the selected vendor be relieved from the associated performance requirement and SLA until the dependency is resolved?	Yes
37.	TIBA Integration: Please clarify the required level of integration with the existing TIBA Spark PARCS, including whether the selected solution is expected to directly control gate operation, validate payments/credentials, and initiate remote gate openings.	Expect a full integration with Tiba.
38.	Existing PARCS Responsibility: Since the City does not intend to replace its existing PARCS and gate equipment, please confirm that maintenance, repair, firmware, configuration, and operational performance of existing TIBA equipment will remain the responsibility of the City and/or its existing PARCS provider.	Confirmed.
39.	IPS Integration: Please clarify the required integration with IPS. Is the proposed solution expected to transmit suspected violations or enforcement "hit lists" to IPS, receive citation/payment status from IPS, or provide a fully bidirectional integration?	Not required but recommended for redundancy.
40.	LPR Accuracy Requirement: The RFP specifies LPR accuracy of 98% or greater in the technical/software requirements but identifies 95% or greater in the SLA section. Please clarify which percentage represents the contractual performance requirement.	98
41.	LPR Accuracy Measurement: Please define how LPR accuracy will be calculated and tested, including whether unreadable, obscured, damaged, temporary, missing, or otherwise non-standard license plates will be excluded from the calculation.	Total misreads / total reads.

42.	Vehicle Location Requirement: The RFP requires the system to identify the location and garage level of vehicles suspected of violations while describing level-by-level occupancy as optional and cost-sensitive. Please clarify the required level of vehicle-location granularity for enforcement purposes.	By garage level to assist enforcement locate the vehicle inside the garage.
43.	Occupancy Accuracy: Please specify the required accuracy standard and measurement methodology for facility occupancy counts and, where applicable, level-specific occupancy counts.	By facility. By level is not required
44.	Skyline Network Infrastructure: The RFP indicates that Skyline Garage does not currently have network access. Please confirm whether the selected vendor is responsible for providing the WAN/internet connectivity necessary for the proposed system and whether recurring connectivity charges should be included in the proposal.	Confirmed
45.	Electrical/Infrastructure Conditions: Please provide available electrical service locations, telecommunications/network rooms, existing conduit pathways, and any known infrastructure limitations at Skyline Garage that vendors should consider in developing their design and pricing.	Unknown at this time. Power is provided at entrances for PARCS, gates, and security cameras.
46.	Hardware Ownership: The RFP states that additional hardware is to remain vendor-owned. Please clarify whether this applies to cameras, sensors, edge devices, network equipment, mounting hardware, cabling, and other installed components, and identify which permanently installed infrastructure, if any, becomes City property.	The City does not want to own hardware. Cabling and conduits can retain as a City asset if vendor desires to leave them in place.
47.	End-of-Term Equipment: At contract expiration or termination, is the selected vendor expected to remove vendor-owned equipment, and if so, will removal and restoration costs be the vendor's responsibility?	No. If equipment and system is operating correctly, they City will want to continue service.

48.	Merchant of Record: The RFP states that the City will not act as Merchant of Record and will not pay direct transactional or banking fees. Please clarify whether the selected vendor is expected to serve as Merchant of Record for any new digital payment solution and whether convenience/service/processing fees may be charged directly to the parking customer.	Not required. Responsibility may be passed along to the third-party technology provider.
49.	Existing Payment Providers: If TEZ, PayByPhone, ParkWhiz or other City-selected payment providers remain in place, please confirm that transaction and processing fees associated with those existing services remain governed by the City's existing agreements and are outside the selected vendor's pricing and financial responsibility.	Confirmed
50.	UAT Restart: The RFP requires 30 consecutive days of successful operation and provides for restarting the UAT period following a Critical or High deficiency. Please confirm that failures attributable to City infrastructure, utilities, existing City equipment, third-party providers/APIs, or other conditions outside the selected vendor's reasonable control will not restart the 30-day UAT period.	All systems and providers identified by the proposer for this RFP. Existing equipment and service is excluded.
51.	UAT Criteria: Will the City and selected vendor mutually establish and approve the mandatory UAT test cases, testing methodology, acceptance criteria, and third-party dependencies before commencement of the UAT period?	Yes if the criteria meets the RFP language.
52.	Liquidated Damages: Please clarify whether SLA liquidated damages/service credits are assessed per incident, per hour/day of noncompliance, or per monthly SLA measurement period, and whether aggregate liquidated damages are subject to a monthly and/or annual maximum.	Per incident per location. Caps were not contemplated. The City is seeking a solution that works and does not have to invoke liquidated damages due to failures.
53.	SLA Responsibility: Please confirm that SLA uptime, response/resolution requirements, and associated liquidated damages will exclude failures attributable to existing City systems, City-provided infrastructure/network services, third-party APIs/providers, scheduled maintenance, utility failures, force majeure, or other circumstances outside the selected vendor's reasonable control.	Confirmed

54.	Pricing for Future Deployments: Because the City may implement facilities in phases, please specify how long proposers are expected to hold the submitted pricing for future locations and whether annual CPI or other mutually agreed adjustments will be permitted for hardware, labor, subscriptions, connectivity, maintenance, and third-party costs.	Yes, understood. Timing is unknown but is influenced by the vendor's product and deployment of staff to install and configure the solution.
55.	Communications: Can you detail the status of communications to each location? Also, who "owns" the contract for communications?	The city owns the network supporting the security camera and the open system to process transactions.
56.	Skyline Garage: Can you clarify the number of lanes that will be utilized for exits in the Skyline Garage?	Depending on operations, it could flex from 2 to 3 during events.
57.	Extension: Due to necessary site visits and upcoming industry conferences/events, could a 10 day extension be granted?	Under consideration.
58.	If the City is not required to pay for new equipment, is the city open to changing the technology being used on each location?	Yes, the City is open to vendor recommendations that will future proof hardware and on-going operations.
59.	What is the monthly parking rate for the garage? Are there different monthly parking rates for weekday vs weekend?	See answers to question #10 above for rate structure. There are no difference in weekday or weekend rates for monthly parking.
60.	Can the monthly rate change?	No.
61.	Is the City willing to provide a trailing 12 for each location? PMC wants to provide the best deal possible to benefit the City, and this information is key to understating where to bring more value.	City does not understand the question or what a trailing 12 is.
62.	If there is no trailing 12, will the City provide each locations total GOP in 2025?	City does not understand the question or what a trailing 12 is.
63.	How much labor did the city have in 2025?	City does not understand the question. Labor for operation? Labor for equipment repairs?

**Finance**

Purchasing Division
929 North Front St.,
10th Floor Post Office
Box 1810
Wilmington, NC
28402-1810

OTHER NOTES:

1. **Reminder - All bids are due Thursday, September 24, 2026, by 3:00pm.**
2. Mailed or delivered sealed bids are to be sent to ariental.fullwood@wilmingtonnc.gov