

Smart Parking Technology Implementation – Job Number Job # 48-23-PW

Q&A

1. QUESTION: Can you please clarify the length of the contract? Is it for 1 year or 3 years?

ANSWER: Three years.

In Form 7 of the RFP, the (1) SMART PARKING TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION COST section should include just the first-year cost as that will have additional implementation costs. In section (2) ANNUAL ONGOING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COST, please add those additional costs for the full three years (please note any overlap in subscription costs if any).

If there are overlaps between sections 1 and 2, then please note that in the assumptions. If there are no subscription costs in the first year because the first year is development and implementation, then note that in the assumptions.

If your hosted pricing does not fit into the format in the RFP, present it in a format that fits your model, but please present it in a format that is easy for us to understand.

2. QUESTION: What is the construction cost estimate or budget associated with the Smart Parking Technology Implementation Project?

ANSWER: Please note on [page 9 of the RFP](#), in the budget and timeline section, the total budget for the project scope as outlined in this RFP is \$80K including contingency (if needed). The City's expectation is that the selected vendor will be able to complete the work based on the deadlines in the RFP assuming Notice to Proceed on 1/31/2024.

3. QUESTION: Is the 80K budget just for Phase 1? Phase 1 and Phase 2? Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the future SaaS amounts? Are we able to append additional details on our technical solution alongside the forms? Or is all our content to stay within the form format?

ANSWER: The \$80k budget is to complete the scope of work elements (both phases) plus the ongoing services for up to three years total.

If your hosted pricing does not fit into the format in the RFP, present it in a format that fits your model, but please present it in a format that is easy for us to understand.

4. QUESTION: Is the Schweers enforcement system data available via API?

ANSWER: No. NOTE that enforcement data collection methods are noted as part of Kirkland's existing downtown parking technologies. However, vendors should focus on the primary functionalities in the scope of work.

5. QUESTION: Is the on-street parking system mobile based or utilize parking meters? Can the City expand upon parking hardware in place?

ANSWER: The City currently charges in two of our city-owned lots, the Lake and Central lot and the Lakeshore lot adjacent to Marina Park. Both of these lots offer both kiosk (pay-station) and mobile pay options. There are six total pay stations between these two lots.

6. QUESTION: Does the City have any existing GIS data for the current street furniture such as fire hydrants, bus stops, curb cuts, etc.? If so, is this information available via API or export?

ANSWER: Yes, the data could be made available.

7. QUESTION: Does the City have a platform in place for this data sharing or is that to be provided within the vendor solution?

ANSWER: The only platform available would be the City's website which could be part of the solution or link to the chosen vendor's solution(s).

8. QUESTION: Can the City describe how the current data is organized or formatted? For instance, is the data organized in Parking Zones, Areas, individual Blocks, etc.?

ANSWER: This level of detail would be a scope of work conversation once the vendor is chosen and we begin to talk about data integration. For instance, the parking sensors are organized by lots, blocks but also identifying 'zones' or groupings such as all ADA parking stalls. Other data sources may differ.

9. QUESTION: In building a comprehensive digital inventory, are you considering any particular formats or standards for asset data, such as the Open Parking Data Standard, to facilitate interoperability and future integration?

ANSWER: Through this process, we look forward to hearing the proposals for various formats and data standards, learning about the pros and cons and choosing which best fits our needs.

10. QUESTION: How does the City envision utilizing predictive analytics for parking demand? Would you be interested in exploring specific machine learning frameworks like TensorFlow or PyTorch for this purpose?

ANSWER: This is out of scope of this RFP. The vendor is welcome to include additional information within the allowed 15 pages but that information will not be considered in the evaluation for this RFP.

11. QUESTION: For dynamic parking management, are there scenarios or special events where you foresee the need for rapid rule changes, and would a rule engine integrated with a dashboard, such as Drools or Red Hat Decision Manager, be of interest?

ANSWER: Yes, there will be special events or the need for rapid rule changes. It will be up to the vendor to communicate to city staff any recommended tool or platform that would be recommended and appropriate to meet the scope of work.

12. QUESTION: Given the need for a resilient and adaptable architecture, would the City be receptive to a hybrid cloud approach, incorporating services like AWS Outposts or Azure Stack for edge computing capabilities?

ANSWER: Yes, as long as the security requirements outlined are met.

11. QUESTION: Can you provide insight into any legacy systems that will require integration with the new smart parking technology, and would an Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) approach using software like MuleSoft or Apache Camel be suitable?

ANSWER: Yes, as long as the security requirements outlined are met.

12. QUESTION: For the user interface, are there specific architectural patterns the City prefers, such as micro-frontends for a scalable and flexible UI experience?

ANSWER: No preference, we'll assess this through the evaluation process and through any follow-up interviews/ demos.

13. QUESTION: To enhance the security posture, is the City open to implementing advanced threat detection systems, like AI-based network behavior analysis tools, or endpoint detection and response (EDR) solutions such as CrowdStrike or SentinelOne?

ANSWER: This is out of scope of this RFP.

14. QUESTION: Is there an interest in adopting a Zero Trust security model, with solutions like Google's BeyondCorp or Cisco's Duo, to ensure stringent access controls for all users accessing the parking management system?

ANSWER: This is out of scope of this RFP.

15. QUESTION: Are there other urban mobility services the City is looking to integrate with the smart parking system, such as e-scooter sharing or bike rental services, and would a Mobility as a Service (MaaS) platform integration be relevant?

ANSWER: Within the scope of work, the RFP notes that *we prioritize support for occupancy tracking, event management, street closures, and micro-mobility management, all aimed at ensuring*

convenient, cost-effective, and equitable access to downtown parking for residents and visitors. If a service meets the scope of work, feel free to include that in your proposal.

16. QUESTION: What is the City's approach to environmental sustainability in smart city projects? Would you be interested in exploring parking solutions that contribute to this, such as incentivizing electric vehicle parking or integrating with smart grid technologies?

ANSWER: Information about how to accommodate information about our electric charging stations (and integrating with them) is welcome. The scope of work includes dynamic pricing strategies which could be an incentive. Additional information outside the scope of work cannot be used as part of the evaluation process.

17. QUESTION: Could you elaborate on the level of integration expected between the smart parking system and other smart city components, like traffic management systems or public transit APIs, for a cohesive urban mobility experience?

ANSWER: Integrating with traffic management and public transit is out of scope for this RFP.

18. QUESTION: In light of the City's smart infrastructure, how do you envision integrating smart parking data with other urban systems, such as traffic light control and emergency response? For instance, would there be value in a system that can prioritize parking for emergency vehicles during peak times using a protocol like the Open Mobility Foundation's Mobility Data Specification (MDS)?

ANSWER: This is out of scope of this RFP. Additional information outside the scope of work cannot be used as part of the evaluation process.

19. QUESTION: To foster a more connected community, is there an appetite for integrating smart parking solutions with public engagement platforms, such as mobile apps or kiosks, that can provide information on city events, promote local businesses, or even support localized digital advertising within the parking interface?

ANSWER: The city is seeking parking solutions that residents and visitors can access this information through a user-friendly interface, enhancing their parking experience. Information that supports this scope of work is welcome.

20. QUESTION: How does the City plan to balance the need for parking revenue against the goals of reducing traffic congestion and promoting alternative transportation modes? Would a model that varies parking pricing based on congestion levels and proximity to public transit stops, employing algorithms similar to those used in demand-responsive transit systems, align with the City's transportation policies?

ANSWER: Information about pricing strategies and approaches are welcome.

21. QUESTION: Given the rapid evolution of smart city technologies, how does the City plan to ensure the proposed smart parking solution remains adaptable to future developments, such as autonomous vehicle pick-up/drop-off zones or the integration of V2X (Vehicle-to-Everything) communications?

ANSWER: This is out of scope of this RFP but information about how the smart solution can adapt is welcome as it pertains to the proposed parking solution. Additional information cannot be used in the evaluation.

22. QUESTION: Has the City considered the benefits of employing advanced data analytics, like AI-driven predictive modeling, to anticipate parking demand surges, and would you be interested in a workshop with our data scientists to explore innovative uses of parking data for urban planning?

ANSWER: This is out of scope of this RFP. Additional demos can be discussed once the RFP process is complete and a vendor has been selected and notified to proceed.

23. QUESTION: We understand the importance of user experience in public-facing solutions. Could we explore the City's interest in accessibility features, such as integration with voice-assisted technologies like Amazon Alexa or Google Assistant, to assist visually impaired users in finding parking?

ANSWER: Yes. Multi-lingual support and other features that accommodate people with hearing or visual impairments are welcome.

24. QUESTION: With cybersecurity being paramount, we're curious about the City's stance on adopting a security-first design. Would the City be interested in a briefing on the latest cybersecurity trends and our methodologies, including the use of blockchain for secure transaction logging in smart parking applications?

ANSWER: This is out of scope of this RFP. Additional demos can be discussed once the RFP process is complete and a vendor has been selected and notified to proceed.

25. QUESTION: In optimizing the financial sustainability of the smart parking initiative, is the City open to exploring innovative revenue models such as dynamic pricing, or partnerships with local businesses that could offer parking validations through our platform as part of a loyalty program? Note on page 6 about dynamic pricing. Note this is a 'nice to have' but still included in the potential project scope

ANSWER: Information about pricing strategies and approaches are welcome.

26. QUESTION: How does the City envision the smart parking solution to contribute to social equity? We have experience in deploying zone-based pricing and providing discounted rates for low-income residents. Would the City be interested in such functionality?

ANSWER: Information about pricing strategies and approaches are welcome. Hearing how the solution supports Kirkland's equity goals would be great.

27. QUESTION: Is the City interested in exploring how smart parking solutions can contribute to its environmental targets, such as by reducing idle times and thus emissions, and whether integration with the City's wider environmental monitoring systems would be beneficial?

ANSWER: This is out of scope of this RFP.

28. The RFP Scope of Work Section (pages 6-7) identifies three (3) separate work efforts identified as Items A, B, and C and then under Item D outlines a two-phase approach. Please clarify or confirm that Phase 1 is solely to perform with work effort identified as Item A - Digital Inventory and Asset Management, and Phase 2 is to perform the work effort Items B - Primary Functions and Item C - Integrations? If our assumption is incorrect, please clarify further.

ANSWER: Correct. Phase 1 pertains to item A but at the completion, we should begin to see a demonstration of the product platform. Phase 2 should finish the integration (Item C) which should result in the functionalities in Item B. This will include a 3-month evaluation period.

29. Under Item C Integrations (page 6-7), the work effort states to integrate with external existing city sources that then identify Flowbird paystations, Schweers Handheld Devices, Genetec License Plate Reader(LPR), and eleven-X Parking sensors. Does the City of Kirkland have an agreement for each of these existing entity-sources to cooperate in providing their data collected in support of the City?

ANSWER: Yes, the city has agreements with Flowbird and eleven-X that includes sharing data for integration. The handheld devices and the LPR are noted as current technologies but will likely not be included. They are noted for the possibility of future integration and Kirkland would facilitate any agreements to ensure data sharing is allowed.

30. Under Phase 2 Integration and Validation that is to be completed by December 31, 2024, does the City's allocated 3-month period for validation proposed to begin on October 1, 2024, or begin on January 1, 2025?

ANSWER: Phase 2, including the three-month evaluation period, will need to be completed by December 31st, 2024 so yes, the validation period will need to begin by October 31st.

31. Under Scope of Work Item B Primary Functionalities, in presenting real-time parking availability, is the City seeking a web application only, or a web application and a smartphone mobile application? Is the City interested in digital signage for on-street and off-street use?

ANSWER: We're seeking a solution that provides real-time occupancy data for the convenience of those using the parking facilities so residents and visitors can access this information through a user-friendly interface, enhancing their parking experience. Any proposal should address this. We are

looking at both a web application and a smartphone mobile application, but we're open to hearing other solutions if they fit the intent of this scope of work. However, digital signage is not budgeted.

32. Under the RFP Section entitled "Deliverables" (page 8), does the City define deliverables as the three (3) distinct scope of work stated Item A - Digital Inventory and Asset Management, Item B - Primary Functionalities, and Item C - Integrations? If not, please clarify with additional information.

ANSWER: The deliverables are outlined in Chapter II: Required Proposal Response Forms between pages 14 and 30. The description of each form (1-9) provides more detail about what is expected.

It is recommended your materials align with the scope of work, requirements and timelines outlined in the RFP, provide system design and technical framework, a plan for implementation, training and ongoing support, etc. This will include a schedule, tasks and subtasks, etc.

33. Follow-up under "Deliverables" (page 8), last bullet item, does the City seek ongoing operations support and maintenance only through the duration of period ending December 31, 2024?

ANSWER: The proposal is for a three-year contract. It is expected that there will need to be some level of on-going support during the three-year duration but assuming after the solution is deployed, support would be minimal (fix any issues, respond to questions, etc.). It will be up to the vendor to propose what ongoing support might be needed based on the proposed solution.

34. Under RFP Attachment Form 7: Price Proposal Table (page 26), and under the major heading IMPLEMENTATION, there is a subheading titled "Digital Inventory". Please confirm this is solely for the proposed cost-price for only Scope of Work Item A - Digital Inventory and Asset Management? If incorrect, please clarify.

ANSWER: Correct. This is for Scope of Work Item A.

35. Under RFP Attachment Form 7: Price Proposal Table (page 26), and under the major heading IMPLEMENTATION, there is a subheading titled "Solution Implementation". Please confirm this is solely for the proposed cost-price for only Scope of Work Item B - Primary Functionalities. If incorrect, please clarify.

ANSWER: Correct. This is for Scope of Work Item B.

36. Under RFP Attachment Form 7: Price Proposal Table (page 26), and under the major heading IMPLEMENTATION, there is a subheading titled "Integration". Please confirm this is solely for the proposed cost-price for only Scope of Work Item C – Integration. If incorrect, please clarify.

ANSWER: Correct. This is for Scope of Work Item C.

37. Under RFP Attachment Form 7: Price Proposal Table (page 26), and under the major heading IMPLEMENTATION, and under subheading titled "Integration", there is a line-item titled Parking Permit**. Please confirm or clarify that the City is not seeking a specific bid cost-price for this line-item but merely a Rough-Order-Magnitude (ROM) cost-price range aligned with some general information discussion points regarding these future systems? If incorrect, please clarify.

ANSWER: Correct. The city is not seeking a bid cost-price for a parking permit database. This is something that the city will be procuring in the future but would like integrated once that procurement happens.

38. Under RFP Attachment Form 7: Price Proposal Table (page 26), and under the major heading IMPLEMENTATION, and under subheading titled "Integration", there is a line-item titled PARCS**. Please confirm or clarify that the City is not seeking a specific bid cost-price for this line-item but merely a Rough-Order-Magnitude (ROM) cost-price range aligned with some general information discussion points regarding these future systems? If incorrect, please clarify.

ANSWER: Correct. The city is not seeking a bid cost-price for parking access and revenue control. This is something that the city may be procuring in the future but would like integrated once that procurement happens. The ROM would be the cost aligned with integrating a future system.

39. Under RFP Attachment Form 7: Price Proposal Table (page 26), at the very top stating a major heading SUBSCRIPTION and followed by a subheading titled "Smart Parking Technology Solution", can the City please clarify where this is defined under the Scope of Work Items A, B, and C as described on pages 6-7? What scope of work and deliverables are to be covered under this cost-price line-item? Please clarify.

ANSWER: In general, the term 'subscription' would be the cost for hosting the service or solution assuming that once the solution is deployed (on an app or even our website) that this service to host is not free. If there is no 'subscription' cost in the first year (Jan. 31, 2024, through to ending on December 31, 2024) because this is the development phase, please note that in the assumptions. However, please include any service cost here if there is any for this first year period.

40. Under RFP Attachment Form 7: Price Proposal Table No. 2 Annual Ongoing Operations and Maintenance Cost (page 27), are these for any cost-price associated with the period of performance from Jan. 31, 2024, through to ending on December 31, 2024? Or, is this for annual ongoing annual ops and maintenance cost-price after December 31, 2024, commencing on Jan. 1, 2025?

ANSWER: Please note any on-going subscription/ service costs once the solution is deployed and also note any overlap for the first year (if any). Please note under the assumptions if maintenance and support will have additional cost outside of the cost for the service/ subscription or if that would be included. Please also note, as stated above, if there will be any subscription costs in the first year during the development and implementation phases.