



**ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA
OFFICE OF THE PURCHASING AGENT**

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION NO. 24-DES-RFI-391

ADDENDUM NO. 1

The following responses are to the questions received in response to Arlington County Request for Information No. 24-DES-RFI-391 for Residential Permit Parking System.

- 1. Question:** 1. Digital Transition Readiness and User-Centric Design Feedback: Has Arlington County gathered specific preferences or apprehensions from residents regarding the shift from physical to digital permits, and is there a plan to engage residents from various demographics in the system's UX/UI development phase to ensure the new system is inclusive and addresses accessibility concerns? Relevant RFP Section: "The RPP program...digital permitting (in whole or in part) is of interest" and "How does your system address various user needs, e.g., elderly, technology disinclined, customers with accessibility issues, etc.?"

Answer: The County is not planning to switch immediately to a solely digital system but rather would be interested in learning about the feasibility of provision of a hybrid solution offering both digital and physical permit options to ensure various user needs are met as we evolve the program over time. An intensive public engagement process specifically for initiating the hybrid process would be unlikely, but a public communication and information period would be probable. The hybrid service itself is also not defined yet – it could be hybrid across permit types, or across geographies, and it may be a short period of hybrid services or a long one. In addition, the County continuously collects customer feedback regarding various program functionalities and adjusts those, if appropriate, on a regular basis and would continue to do so under a hybrid scenario.

- 2. Question:** 2. Complex Eligibility Scenarios and Permit Eligibility Automation: How often does Arlington County encounter unique eligibility cases, such as temporary changes in resident status or new constructions, and how does the County envision the new system adapting to real-time eligibility alterations in these scenarios? Relevant RFP Section: "The new software system must be able to evaluate applicants' eligibility and restrict or allow permit type and number based on determined eligibility categories."

Answer: The language "The new software system must be able to evaluate applicants' eligibility and restrict or allow permit type and number based on determined eligibility categories." pertains to a pre-defined eligibility status on a household address basis which the system should have saved on the backend. The current system "categorizes" based on application input. The customer types in their household address, the system checks first the

eligibility category based on address (classified either as a 2 vehicle decals versus 4 vehicle decals address) and then cross-checks other existing application accounts for the same household address to see if some or all of the allowed number of permit materials (decals, Flexpass, Visitor passes) are already taken. If all materials are taken, the customer would not be allowed to finalize the application (gets a notification stating as such and may contact RPP staff for questions); if only some materials have been taken, the customer would be allowed to apply for remaining materials in their price category. After the customer applies, RPP staff reviews the application and verifies residency or ownership requirements manually (checks attached proof of residency documentation, reviews County property assessment ownership details, checks Commissioner of Revenue vehicle registration) and either approves or denies the application. Customers with an approved application receive an automated email from the system that materials are ready to be paid and customers may either go to their customer portal or use a payment link to finalize the payment and application process.

In terms of new or changing household address eligibility, new or changed status is determined by RPP staff, and the current system requires RPP staff to then reach out to the software vendor's IT staff to request system changes (adding new or removing old addresses and categorizing them either as 2 or 4 decal households). If the future system could provide the option for RPP staff to make such changes themselves that would be of interest.

- 3. Question:** 3. Data Integration Specifics and Advanced Data Analytics Utilization: Could you delve into the challenges faced with the current system's integration with the Vehicle Personal Property Tax database, especially concerning data accuracy and update delays, and is there an interest within Arlington County in utilizing predictive analytics for improved data-driven decision-making? Relevant RFP Section: The existing system automatically uses...Commissioner of Revenue" and "Reporting capabilities of the solution – both standard and configurable.

Answer: The existing real-time check of the Vehicle Personal Property Tax database works well. It may take up to 2-3 days for changes to a vehicle registration to show but that is on the Commissioner of Revenue side rather than a functionality challenge of the RPP system.

- 4. Question:** 4. Data Security Standards and Disaster Recovery Protocols: Are there specific local regulatory mandates or internal policy standards concerning data handling, encryption, or breach notifications that the new system should stringently adhere to, and could the County provide insights into specific expectations regarding data integrity and recovery in critical operational areas? Relevant RFP Section: "Approach to data security, data privacy, system redundancy and system failover. "

Answer: The County is required to meet the Library of Virginia data retention policies. RFPs generally contain standard language on security. Overall, it is critical that the system is operational at all times, for customers and for RPP staff. During times of highest activity, a system stoppage or failure can affect hundreds of applicants in a matter of just days, and those experiences quickly become high-visibility failures that impact County leadership and community trust. Further, such system failures can put a great burden on RPP staff during the analysis of the issue and the recovery process to ensure all customers are served. Therefore, we

are interested in understanding the commitments that could be made, and level of certainty, around continuous, reliable operations.

5. **Question:** 5. Custom Reporting Requirements: Could you specify any particular reporting formats or data insights, possibly required by local policies, that the current system doesn't sufficiently provide and should be prioritized in the new solution? Relevant RFP Section: "Reporting capabilities of the solution – both standard and configurable."

Answer: Staff is currently able to pull reports on any household, permit material type, account, payment, application, some RPP staff system actions, and general customer information.

Current reports have been set up to report on what is needed, but some of the attributes (for example RPP staff ID attributes aka who approved, cancelled, reissued permits, and related dates of action such as when was a permit applied for, when was it approved, when was it cancelled) had to be requested to be added to the report functionality post-delivery of the solution. This RFI is asking for information about what data are possible to see in vendor systems through reporting functions and the level of customizability of those reports.

6. **Question:** 6. Legacy System Transition Experience: Are there insights from past digital transitions within the County that could inform the upcoming shift, especially unexpected hurdles in data migration or staff adaptation? Relevant RFP Section: "Available implementation services, including configuration, data conversion, testing, training, and user support."

Answer: Due to the intricacy of the RPP program (various permit materials with different pricing schemes and potential varying distribution patterns over different applicants of one household), the transition process to the current system was lengthy and presented some challenges (e.g. challenges understanding all program requirements, challenges meeting stated timelines, challenges with testing not fully replicating the real world use of the system, challenges obtaining resources to fix issues, challenges with delays and problems associated with reporting capabilities and report accuracy, etc.).

7. **Question:** 7. Scalability for Evolving Needs: Given the potential for rapid shifts in community dynamics and policy changes, could the County elaborate on anticipated developments that might influence permit demand or methodologies? Relevant RFP Section: "The Parking Team would like to evaluate all possible options and vendors available to meet the varied and evolving needs of the RPP program."

Answer: The most likely change/addition to permit functionality would be digital permitting options which could be linked to new enforcement capabilities/technologies.

Another change may be the expirations of permits and when, how, or how often resident would have to get them renewed (e.g., auto renew/autopayment functionality, 2-year permits, etc.)

In addition, continued improvements to existing staff-facing system capabilities such as automating the issuance of replacement permits or the proof of residency/homeownership evaluation process are of interest to enhance RPP staff efficiency. In general, the County is

interested learning about how system designs across the industry attempt to minimize the complexity of the process for both resident applicants and staff administrators.

The County would be interested in hearing from vendors about any innovations they are implementing related to integrations of RPP and other curb space use management tools or approaches.

- 8. Question:** 8. Integration with Broader Smart City Initiatives: In the context of wider urban technological integrations, does the County foresee the proposed system linking with broader smart city infrastructures, such as traffic management systems or public safety networks? Relevant RFP Section: "Is the solution standalone, or does it interconnect with other jurisdictions or entities?"

Answer: The language "Is the solution standalone, or does it interconnect with other jurisdictions or entities?" pertains more to the question of if the County RPP system could potentially be impacted by other jurisdictions' system upgrades/changes. If the software backend is essentially used by many different places and being changed by many different customers' demands at the same time, we would want to understand how this is managed to ensure system reliability and consistency for our customers.

In terms of smart city initiatives, however, we would be interested in exploring potential benefits of integration with enforcement as well as curbside use management technologies as mentioned in answer to number 7.

The balance of the solicitation remains unchanged.

Arlington County, Virginia

Cynthia Davis, CPPB, VCO
Assistant Purchasing Agent
cdavis@arlingtonva.us

RETURN THIS PAGE, FULLY COMPLETED AND SIGNED, WITH YOUR PROPOSAL:

OFFEROR ACKNOWLEDGES RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM NUMBER 1

FIRM NAME: _____

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE: _____ **DATE:** _____