



## **PURCHASING**

**July 7, 2026**

**MEMO TO:** Prospective Bidders

**FROM:** Kimberly Toon, Purchasing Manager

**SUBJECT:** **Addendum #1:** Photo Citation (Red-Light Camera) Program Services

**DUE DATE AND TIME:** **JULY 30, 2026 at 2:00 p.m.**

1. The Bid Documents are hereby modified by this Addendum #1 dated July 7, 2026. To include the following:

**a. Q&A**

2. The foregoing changes shall be incorporated in the Bid Documents, and a copy of the Addendum #1, signed by the Bidder, must accompany the Bid to indicate the Bidder's familiarity with the changes.

**a. Q&A Responses**

- **Question:** It states under 2.1 that by submitting a proposal respondents are bound by the contract terms and conditions outlined in the RFP however does state under 2.4.4 that vendors can submit exceptions. Please confirm that vendors are in fact allowed to submit exceptions to the general terms and conditions specified.

**Answer:** Vendors can submit exceptions to the general terms and conditions specified. The City will take these exceptions into consideration when reviewing and scoring submittals.

- **Question:** Will the City please agree to a 2 week extension of the deadline on the procurement?

**Answer:** No.

- **Question:** Will experience with other automated enforcement programs (e.g., speed enforcement) be considered acceptable alongside red-light camera program experience, or is red-light-specific experience required exclusively?

**Answer:** Under Section 2.4.2., qualified firms are limited to those that have provided photo citation program services. Photo citation program services, in this case, are to mean “Red-Light Camera” programs. This is further identified under 2.5.2.10.

- **Question:** Is capturing front-facing driver images required, or are rear/license plate images sufficient for compliance with City requirements?

**Answer:** After further discussion with FayPD, front-facing driver images are preferred but not required. The final contract with the selected proposer will reflect as much.

- **Question:** Can the City provide the historical collection rate for red-light camera citations (i.e., percentage of issued citations that were paid)?

**Answer:** This information cannot be provided at this time.

- **Question:** Can the City provide total annual citation volumes for the previous program for its last 2–3 years of operation?

**Answer:** This information cannot be provided at this time.

- **Question:** Which tab of the appendices-excel-version-xlsx will fulfill the requirement of Appendix C. There are two tabs within the provided excel document that both contain Appendix C with different formatting. Please confirm which tab to be used: Appendix C or the tab titled Summary.

**Answer:** Appendix C, D, and E (the Excel file) is no longer required to be submitted with the proposal.

- **Question:** Would Fayetteville be open to extending the page count to 25 pages front and back (50) instead of 15 pages front and back (30)?

**Answer:** Yes. The page limit is extended to 25 pages front and back (50 total pages).

- **Question:** Will Fayetteville accept digital signatures on the hard copy original of the RFP response submission?

**Answer:** Yes.

- **Question:** Please confirm how the redacted proposal shall be included within the submission. Should it be included as a hard copy or a version on the USB drive with the electronic submission.

**Answer:** Please provide a redacted and non-redacted version on the USB drive and provide a hard copy of the non-redacted version.

- **Question:** Due to the number of questions and the size of the opportunity, will the City extend the due date for the Proposal to at least two weeks to allow vendors to respond carefully with full information?

**Answer:** No.

- **Question:** Will Fayetteville define expected use cases for 24/7 monitoring (operator vs passive)

**Answer:** Passive.

- **Question:** Section 1.1 Introduction states “The Program will be deployed at intersections identified by the City based on safety data, with an initial implementation of approximately ten (10) camera systems (see **Appendix A**) and the potential for expansion during the contract term.

Question – Does the City mean 10 Camera Intersections which could consist of multiple systems (ex: NB, SB would be 2 different camera systems) which would exceed the quantity of 10 systems OR does the City intend to only have 1 camera system installed per identified intersection so would actually total 10 systems?

If the City intends for 10 intersections and not only 1 camera per intersection – Does the City intend for all directions of travel to be covered by enforcement, only assume primary directions of travel (ex: at a 4 way intersection assume 2 Primary directions)?

**Answer:** The initial implementation will be 10 cameras for 10 intersections, where each intersection receives 1 camera. The leg of the intersection they will be installed on will be identified during contract negotiation. The cameras installed will be only for the one leg they're on and are not expected to monitor the entire intersection or additional legs.

- **Question:** As the vendor is to propose a Fixed Price per camera per month. Please explain the relevance as well as provide more guidance on completing Appendix C, D, and E. A more simplified approach would be to for each vendor to clearly outline ONLY a Fixed Fee per camera per month charge inclusive of all services requested in the RFP.

Any “additional” services outside of Red Light enforcement could be clearly outlined in the proposal response

**Answer:** Appendix C, D, and E (the Excel file) is no longer required to be submitted with the proposal.

- **Question:** The DMV and processing sections seem in conflict. Would like confirmation on the processing expectations.

**Answer:** While this RFP outlines the proposed scope of work, corrections are expected prior to the contract being finalized with a selected proposer. The inconsistencies in the RFP highlighted from this question will be revised prior to the contract being finalized with a selected proposer in the following manner:

**Regarding the DMV Lookup being 30 days, and then making 6 attempts 7 days apart:**

4.2.7.2 states the proposer must obtain registered owner (RO) information within thirty (30) days for citable offenses. The second sentence of that item is to clarify that if the DMV does not return RO information within seven (7) businesses of days of the query being made, to then submit a follow-up query. The total of six (6) attempts is an error in the RFP and should instead say “three (3)” attempts.

**Regarding “process by 5 days”:**

4.2.11.9 states “Proposer shall provide a credit against the monthly fee equal to the loss of revenue if Proposer fails to provide the completed notice of violation containing all color photographs within five (5) calendar days following retrieval of the images to the FayPD...”

The “5 days” is the time provided between the violation being captured, and the proposer providing it to FayPD. FayPD will review the images provided and respond to the proposer that a violation is valid, at which time the proposer may proceed with finishing the processing and mailing of notifications of violations. The five (5) days to provide that information to FayPD, does not require the proposer to provide the owner information for the violation to FayPD. It is just for the images to determine if a violation should be upheld.

**Regarding mail by 11 days:**

4.2.8.5 states “Violations for which registered owner data is available shall normally be issued within seven (7) business days after FayPD review of the incident.”

4.2.11.9 states “Proposer shall provide a credit against the monthly fee equal to the loss of revenue if Proposer fails to...mail out the violation notice within eleven (11) calendar days of the violation.”

The “eleven (11) calendar days” should instead say “within seven (7) business days after FayPD review of the incident.”

- **Question:** What triggers expansion: Crash thresholds? Budget availability?

**Answer:** City Council's appetite to expand the program to additional locations is what will trigger any expansion. Locations will be reviewed and selected based on crash history, red-light running citations as documented by FayPD, as well as recommendations from the selected proposer based on their studies.

- **Question:** Clarification that images, resumes, and graphics qualify as exhibits.

**Answer:** This is standard language, and exhibits would be specifically identified and requested in the RFP. Images, resumes, and graphics provided by proposers do not qualify as exhibits.

- **Question:** Can the City please clarify whether proposers are required to provide delinquent collection services as part of the scope of work, or if this reference is intended only to support reporting, tracking, or coordination of delinquent accounts

**Answer:** Collections for delinquent accounts are handled by the City. Proposers are not required to provide collections but will be required to provide monthly reporting of those who haven't paid, the value of the ticket, and the age of the ticket.

- **Question:** Please clarify the scope of "absorbing the cost." Does this refer only to the Proposer's own processing/ mailing costs, or does it extend to the underlying \$100 civil penalty? Citations "failed to be upheld in administrative hearing" can result from factors outside the Proposer's control; will the City limit this provision to errors actually caused by the Proposer?

**Answer:** If a citation fails to be upheld in the administrative hearing due to vendor operations, the vendor will be responsible for entirety of penalty including the lost revenue. If an administrative hearing determines that the failure resulted from circumstances outside of the vendor's control, no penalty will be assessed.

- **Question:** North Carolina red-light enforcement under N.C.G.S. 160A-300.1 is civil owner-liability and does not require identifying the driver. Please confirm whether front/driver images are required for enforcement, or whether rear-plate imaging is sufficient, given privacy considerations, optimal camera placement and cost.

**Answer:** After further discussion with FayPD, front-facing driver images are preferred but not required. The final contract with the selected proposer will reflect as much.

- **Question:** For the Fort Bragg expansion preference, can the City clarify (a) the contracting vehicle (a City contract versus a separate federal agreement), (b) which federal procurement rules would actually apply to City-issued citations on the installation, and (c) whether these federal-compliance items are scored preferences only or mandatory minimum requirements?

**Answer:** (a) The selected proposer will enter into a contract with the City, and the City is expected to hold an IGSA with Fort Bragg. (b) Federal procurement rules apply to equipment installed on the installation. These procurement rules are only required should the City expand services to Fort Bragg. No intersections listed in the RFP are on the installation. (c) Scored preferences only.

- **Question:** Will the City align this provision with the general 30-day cure period (Section 4.2.27) so that a PCI issue reasonably susceptible to cure does not result in immediate termination, and confirm what PCI evidence (e.g., an Attestation of Compliance) the City requires?

**Answer:** Yes, there will be a general 30-day cure period. The City requires standard industry standard guidelines for PCI evidence.

- **Question:** Please confirm the City's expectation that the Proposer serve as Merchant of Record (including chargeback responsibility), and confirm that a convenience fee charged to violators for online/phone card payments (historically up to 5%) remains permissible and may be retained by the Proposer.

**Answer:** The selected proposer shall be the Merchant of Record. The selected proposer may attach credit card transaction fees onto the ticket or may propose the City reimburse for credit card fees.

- **Question:** There is an apparent conflict between the three (3) case studies/references required in Section 2.4.2 and the five (5) references required in Appendix B. Please confirm the required number of references/case studies and where each should appear.

**Answer:** Three (3) case studies/references are required at a minimum; five (5) is the maximum. Five (5) spaces are provided but only three (3) are required.

- **Question:** Will the City consider a reasonable cap or reimbursement for repeated Expert Witness court appearances, particularly under a fixed-fee model?

**Answer:** Appeals go to an administrative hearing and not court.

Should excessive repeated Expert Witness administrative hearing appearances occur, as outlined under 4.2.14.2, the proposer shall train City-identified individuals to qualify as expert witnesses, and the City will provide those witnesses for the administrative hearings.

- **Question:** Please confirm whether professional liability insurance is required for this Program, and identify which FEMA clauses apply given the funding source is identified as “General” (i.e., non-federal).

**Answer:** Section 5.4 details the insurance requirement. FEMA language is standard language included in the RFP. No known FEMA clauses apply specifically to this program.

- **Question:** Are these Appendices relevant since we are not billing per staff, as this is fixed fee?

**Answer:** Appendix C, D, and E (the Excel file) is no longer required to be submitted with the proposal.

**Bidder Acknowledgement:**

Bidder Name (Print):\_\_\_\_\_

Bidder Signature:\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Signature:\_\_\_\_\_