



City of Raleigh

Request for Proposals #: 274- SWS04202026Cablink-A

Title: SWS In-CAB Technology: Refuse Truck Cameras

Proposal Due Date and Time: July 1, 2026, 3:00 PM EST

ADDENDUM NO. 1

Issue Date: June 10, 2026

Issuing Department: Solid Waste Services

Direct all inquiries concerning this RFP to:

Kathleen Mitchell

Supervisor Business Services

Kathleen.Mitchell@raleighnc.gov

Issue Date: June 10, 2026

To: All Proposers

This Addendum, containing the following additions, clarifications, and/or changes, is issued prior to receipt of proposal packages and does hereby become part of the original RFP documents and supersedes the original RFP documents in case of conflict.

Receipt of this addendum must be acknowledged by signing in the area indicated below. Please make the follow additions, clarifications, and/or changes to the RFP as listed below and **sign and return this addendum with your proposal package.**

Questions:

1. The RFP requires installation to be performed outside of standard operating hours (Tuesday through Friday, 5:00 AM to 5:00 PM). Can the City confirm whether weekend installation windows are permissible, and whether any blackout periods exist due to seasonal operational demands or special service events?

A: Weekend installation is permissible; no blackout periods other than city holidays. There is no expectation that all vehicles have to be installed simultaneously. A rolling basis is acceptable.

2. Please confirm the total number of vehicles anticipated for full-fleet deployment under each component, broken down by vehicle type (Automated Side-Loader, Rear-Loader, and special-service units). Will all vehicle types be included in the initial rollout, or will deployment be phased by vehicle class?

A: An estimate can be provided at this time. Approximately 60 Automated Side Loaders and 40 Rearend Loaders are the bulk of the department's fleet. There are other vehicles including RL PUP (8), Knuckleboom (3), and Ford F550 (4) trucks that may require their own configuration.

Pricing should clearly identify one-time and recurring costs so the City can evaluate the cost of adding, replacing, or scaling vehicles over time.

3. The RFP references both a turnkey deployment option and the ability to retrofit existing backup and hopper camera systems. Can the City provide the make, model, and approximate age of any existing onboard camera equipment currently installed in the fleet, so that vendors may accurately assess compatibility and scope retrofit pricing?

A: The City will provide representative examples for a typical rear loader and a typical automated side loader to support compatibility and retrofit pricing assumptions. Existing onboard camera equipment, where present, is expected to be model year 2022 or newer.

Typical ASL: 2024 Freightliner EconicSD with Safety Vision (2) 650FHD Exterior Cameras and LED7-S monitor for viewing (or similar).

Typical REL: 2022 Crane Carrier LET2-44 with Third Eye (2) AWT2020T Exterior Cameras and AWT07MLED monitor for viewing (or similar).

4. Are there specific camera mounting locations required or preferred by the City for each vehicle type (e.g., cab-forward, driver-side arm, hopper/body interior, curbside, rear)? If camera placement requirements differ between Automated Side-Loaders and Rear-Loaders, please describe the preferred configuration for each.

A: The city would like the option to customize configuration based on cost. The most advanced configuration would be a six camera configuration for the automated side loader: cab-forward, house-side, street-side, hopper, and rear. The rearend loader and PUP configuration would be five cameras: cab-forward, house-side, street-side, and rear.

5. What in-cab display or tablet hardware, if any, is currently deployed in the fleet? Will the vendor be expected to supply, integrate with, or replace existing in-cab hardware as part of this engagement?

A: The City currently utilizes one in-cab monitor/display to support camera viewing. Proposers should not assume that existing monitors will be retained. Proposers shall describe their recommended approach for delivering a fully functional in-cab camera viewing experience, including whether their proposed system requires replacement, integration, or reuse of existing display hardware. If replacement or additional hardware is recommended or required, proposers should clearly identify the hardware, installation requirements, compatibility considerations, and associated costs in their proposal. The City is seeking the vendor's recommendation and does not prescribe a specific hardware configuration. A tablet is not expected as part of this solution.

6. The RFP specifies that reviewable safety incident data and video must be searchable for up to 30 days and recoverable for the duration of the tool's existence once flagged. Can the City clarify whether this data retention requirement is to be fulfilled through on-vehicle local storage, cloud-based storage, or a combination of both? Is there a preference for one architecture over the other?

A: The City prefers a cloud-based storage architecture for items deemed long-term recoverable but will consider hybrid approaches where necessary to support vehicle connectivity and storage limitations or operational continuity. Proposers should describe how their solution satisfies the 30-day searchable review period and long-term recoverability of flagged incident data and video. Any on-vehicle storage component should be clearly explained, including its purpose, retention limits, retrieval process, security controls, and associated costs.

7. Does the City have existing cloud infrastructure (e.g., Microsoft Azure, AWS, or Google Cloud) with which the proposed solution must comply or integrate? Are there data residency

requirements that mandate storage within specific geographic boundaries or on City-managed servers?

A: The City does not require the proposed solution to comply with or integrate into a specific existing cloud infrastructure, and there are no current data residency or City-managed server requirements for this solution. However, the proposed solution will be subject to the City's vendor security review process. Proposers shall identify applicable security controls, hosting architecture, data storage location, compliance standards, and related security practices without requiring a non-disclosure agreement (NDA).

8. What are the City's cybersecurity and data governance requirements for video and telemetry data transmitted from fleet vehicles? Are vendors required to comply with specific frameworks such as SOC 2, NIST, or City of Raleigh Information Technology policies?

A: Vendors selected for interviews/demos will be subject to the City's vendor security review process. Proposers should be prepared to identify applicable security controls, hosting architecture, data storage location, compliance standards, and related security practices without requiring a non-disclosure agreement (NDA).

9. The RFP calls for automated photo capture triggered by lift and actuator events for positive service verification. Can the City clarify the acceptable tolerance for missed or failed automated captures due to environmental conditions such as inclement weather, low light, or obstructed camera views? How will edge cases of this nature be handled in the service record?

A: The City has not established a fixed acceptable tolerance for missed or failed automated captures caused by inclement weather, low light, obstruction, or other environmental conditions. Proposers should identify their recommended performance standard, expected capture success rate, known limitations, and mitigation methods, recognizing that camera-based systems can experience degraded performance under adverse weather, lighting, or blocked-view conditions.

Edge cases should not be treated as successful positive service verification unless the record contains sufficient supporting evidence. The service record should clearly identify the event status, such as captured, partially captured, capture failed, camera obstructed, low visibility, or manual review required. Where feasible, the system should retain available metadata such as lift/actuator signal, timestamp, GPS location, vehicle, or service address. Proposers should describe how exceptions are flagged, reviewed, audited, and resolved within their system.

10. Would the City consider a service verification methodology in which the vehicle operator manually initiates a service confirmation event — for example, via a designated in-cab control/button — in lieu of or as a supplement to fully automated sensor-based triggering? This approach could reduce the incidence of false non-service detections that may arise in residential collection environments where route density and stop frequency create ambiguous sensor signals. If this methodology is acceptable under certain conditions, please describe the circumstances under which it would be permitted.

A: The City's preferred methodology is automated service capture triggered by applicable vehicle, lift, actuator, camera, or system events, with manual review used to resolve exceptions or indeterminate records. Driver-initiated events should not replace automated positive service verification as the typical process. It may be considered as a supplemental exception workflow for non-standard service conditions, such as cart not out, improperly preparation, poor weather, or low-light. Thos would be for exceptions only. Any driver-initiated event must include timestamp, vehicle/location metadata, operator input or reason code, and should trigger back-office review before being treated as a final service determination. The City's operational goal is for drivers to focus on driving and collection activities. Where a driver-initiated exception input is needed, a simple physical button or comparable control is preferred.

11. For residential Automated Side-Loader routes specifically, what is the City's tolerance for false-negative service events — instances where the system logs a missed pickup when service was in fact completed? Is there a defined threshold of acceptable false detection rates, and how does the City intend to adjudicate disputed service records?

A: The City has not established a defined tolerance or threshold for false-negative service events on residential Automated Side-Loader routes, as this type of automated service verification represents a new operational standard. Proposers should identify their expected false-negative rate, detection methodology, and recommended process for minimizing incorrect missed-pickup records. Disputed or indeterminate service records should be adjudicated through back-office review using available supporting evidence, including images/video, lift or actuator events, GPS location, timestamps, route data, vehicle data, or operator-submitted exception information if applicable.

12. Does the City require service verification records to be generated at the individual cart or container level, the address level, or both? Please clarify the minimum granularity of verification required for the system to be considered compliant.

A: The City considers address-level service verification to be the minimum required granularity for compliance. The City recognizes that GPS-to-address matching can be imperfect in residential collection environments due to stop density, curb placement, weak signal, or other field conditions. Proposers should describe their methodology for associating service events to addresses, and any event that cannot be confidently assigned should be flagged as indeterminate or requiring review. The City would work with the vendor to refine or adjust location data to improve the system's ability to assign service events more accurately.

13. How does the City envision supervisors and customer service staff accessing and reviewing service verification records and photo evidence? Is real-time access required during active collection routes, or is post-route review considered sufficient for daily operations?

A: Staff should be able to access service verification records and photo evidence through a secure web-based or back-office portal with search, filtering, and review capabilities by location, route, vehicle, date/time, and service status. Near real-time access during active routes is preferable for operational visibility and same-day issue resolution. Post-route review is acceptable for daily usage where connectivity, processing, or validation delays exist.

14. The RFP identifies an AI detection module pilot on 8 to 10 vehicles within the first six months. Can the City clarify whether the vehicles selected for the pilot will be drawn from the Automated Side-Loader fleet, the Rear-Loader fleet, or a mix of both? Will pilot vehicles represent a specific route type or geographic area within the service territory?

A: It would include a mix of both Automated Side-Loader and Rear-Loader vehicles. If the primary focus is cart presence tied to address for verification, trucks will likely be garbage routes.

15. Beyond contamination identification and cart presence verification, is the City interested in evaluating any additional AI-based detection capabilities during the pilot phase, such as pedestrian or proximity detection near the vehicle, overloaded container detection, or driver behavior monitoring? If so, please describe the priority ranking of these use cases.

A: The primary business case for the pilot is AI-based cart presence verification tied to address-level service records. A secondary case may be tied to one or two recycling vehicles if identifying contamination that is also tied to an address. A tertiary case is for yard waste Rear-Loaders identifying leaf piles tied to an address.

The City is also interested in understanding additional AI-based detection capabilities that may provide broader municipal value, such as safety, housing code compliance, digitization of road signs, identifying physical road conditions, stormwater blockages, or asset-based data collection. These can be presented as optional or future-state capabilities rather than the primary pilot priority.

16. The RFP establishes performance benchmarks of greater than 80% detection accuracy for contamination and greater than 95% for cart presence. Can the City describe the methodology it intends to use to validate these benchmarks during and following the pilot — for example, manual spot audits, supervisor review panels, or automated comparison against route completion records?

A: The City anticipates validating pilot performance through manual review of sampled service events, with a greater initial focus on false negatives and indeterminate records while the model is trained and refined. The City expects designated staff to be trained on the review process and anticipates that supervisor spot audits will occur on a recurring basis to ensure the tool's effectiveness. Internal GIS will also work to automate the validation of available records against route completion data on a regular basis. Where certain locations or service conditions repeatedly produce false positives, false negatives, or indeterminate records, operator feedback may be used to identify patterns, refine address-matching logic, and support model improvement.

17. Is the AI detection pilot intended to serve as a gate for full-fleet deployment, meaning that successful pilot performance is required before the City will authorize broader rollout? If so, what is the anticipated decision timeline following the conclusion of the pilot period?

A: Yes, 30 days following pilot with availability of funds.

18. The RFP references API integration with CityWorks and customer notification systems. Can the City describe the specific data exchange expected through this integration — for example, whether the intent is for service verification events and exceptions to automatically generate or update work orders in CityWorks, or whether the integration is intended to push notification data to residents? Please clarify the direction of data flow and the triggering conditions for each integration point.

A: The City's long-term goal is to support both types of integration. The near-term priority for the City is a vendor willing to work toward practical integration, including making service records, exceptions, photos, or secure URL links available in Cityworks or similar connected enterprise systems, rather than requiring staff to manage multiple platforms. The City anticipates that routine verified service events would remain available in the proposer's system, while exception records would be triggered for review or integration based on event metadata, model confidence, service status, address-matching confidence, operator input, or other defined business rules. Examples of exception triggers may include missed-service detection, contamination detection, blocked or inaccessible cart, cart not present, failed or incomplete capture, indeterminate model result, low-confidence address match, disputed service record, or supervisor review flag.

19. Regarding the referenced Power BI integration, can the City clarify whether vendors are expected to deliver pre-built report templates and dashboards, or whether the integration requirement is limited to making data available via a verifiable API endpoint for the City to develop its own reporting views? What specific operational metrics does the City prioritize for visualization in Power BI?

A: Vendors are not expected to provide pre-built Power BI report templates or dashboards; a verifiable API endpoint is acceptable. Priority metrics include service verification status by address and route, false positive/negative and indeterminate review outcomes, exception trends by route or vehicle, and container count data.

20. The RFP references integration with ESRI geographic information system platforms for customer reporting and notifications. Is the City currently using a specific ESRI product suite (e.g., ArcGIS Online, ArcGIS Enterprise), and does the City expect the vendor solution to write spatial data back into ESRI, consume spatial data from ESRI, or both?

A: The City utilizes ArcGIS Enterprise. Specific ESRI integration requirements may be discussed further during discovery meetings with proposers selected for interviews.

21. Does the City require the proposed solution to integrate with its existing Customer Relationship Management system for resident-facing service status updates and exception notifications? If so, can the City identify the CRM platform currently in use and describe the desired data fields and communication triggers expected from the integration?

A: The City does not require CRM integration for resident-facing service status updates or exception notifications as an initial requirement. Proposers should describe their system's ability to provide resident-facing service updates and exception notifications. Specific CRM platform details, communication triggers, and any potential future integration expectations may be discussed further during discovery meetings with proposers selected for interviews.

22. The RFP describes an open, future-proof architecture as a requirement. Can the City describe what open architecture means in the context of this procurement — specifically, whether vendors are required to publish documented APIs, support third-party hardware interoperability, or adhere to specific data interchange standards such as REST, GTFS, or Open311?

A: Open architecture means the City is seeking an open, standards-based, and integration-capable solution with documented APIs, exportable data, secure access methods, and the ability to exchange data with City systems or future third-party tools without vendor lock-in. RESTful APIs are preferred where applicable. Proposers should describe support for existing third-party hardware interoperability and any proprietary dependencies where applicable.

23. The RFP references service-level agreement support for hardware maintenance and software integrations as an evaluation criterion. Can the City provide guidance on the minimum SLA response times it expects for critical system outages, non-critical hardware failures, and software integration issues, respectively? Are on-site response obligations anticipated, or is remote support sufficient for most scenarios?

A: The City expects proposers to define SLA commitments by severity level, including initial response, escalation, workaround, and target resolution timelines. As guidance, the City expects critical system outages to receive response or escalation within 24 hours, software integration issues within 72 hours, and non-critical hardware failures within one week, with resolution times to match (i.e. critical outage response within 24 hours and resolution within 48 hours). Remote support is expected to resolve most issues, with training available for City staff to perform basic on-site troubleshooting, replacement, or maintenance where feasible.

24. What is the City's expectation for system uptime availability on an annualized basis? Are there defined maintenance windows during which planned downtime is acceptable, and if so, are those windows aligned with non-operational hours for the fleet?

A: The City has not established a specific annualized uptime requirement at this stage and expects proposers to identify their standard uptime commitments, monitoring practices, maintenance procedures, and any exclusions. Planned downtime is acceptable when scheduled in advance and aligned with non-operational fleet hours to minimize disruption to collection operations.

25. Will the vendor be responsible for end-user training for both drivers and supervisory staff as part of the deployment scope? Please describe the City's expectations for training format, duration, and any ongoing training obligations for new personnel onboarded after initial deployment.

A: The vendor will be responsible for training designated City staff who will serve as internal superusers. These power users will work to train the broader driver, supervisor, and support staff groups. Initial training should include sufficient instruction, materials, and documentation to support internal rollout and day-to-day use of the system. After initial deployment, ongoing vendor training obligations are expected to apply primarily to replacement or newly assigned power users, with routine end-user training handled internally by the City.

26. The RFP states that vendors may respond to one or more of the three functional components individually. Can the City confirm whether proposals covering only a subset of components will be evaluated on equal footing with proposals covering the full scope, or whether full-scope proposals will be scored more favorably under the Fit to Department Use Case criteria?

A: Proposals covering one, multiple, or all functional components will be evaluated proportionately based on the components proposed. A proposal covering only a subset of components will not be penalized solely for not addressing the full scope, but will be scored based on how well it satisfies the applicable use cases and evaluation criteria for the component or components included. The City reserves the right to award contracts to one or multiple vendors if doing so is determined to best meet the City's operational and technical needs.

27. Does the City anticipate awarding this contract to a single vendor for all components, or is the City open to a multi-vendor award where different vendors are selected for different components? If a multi-vendor scenario is considered, how does the City intend to manage integration responsibilities between vendors?

A: The City is open to awarding contracts to one or multiple vendors if doing so is determined to best meet the City's operational and technical needs. The City will provide overall project management in a multi-vendor scenario. Proposers should describe their ability to coordinate with other vendors and identify prior examples where they successfully participated in multi-vendor implementations.

28. Could we find out what companies you are using for your billing and routing software so we can verify our system will integrate with no issues?

A: Proposers should describe previous history of integration with municipal routing, GIS, work order, or customer service systems through standards-based architecture, such as documented APIs, data exports, or secure file exchange. Additional system-specific information may be discussed during discovery with vendors selected for interviews.

29. Is the City of Raleigh open to exceptions to their sample contract?

A: No.

30. Page 5 of the RFP has language which suggests a submission which is ONLY electronic (i.e. email) will suffice. Can the City confirm if this is true?

A: Page 5 of the RFP states proposer must submit one (1) signed original, one (1) electronic version and six (6) copies of the signed proposal delivered to the address listed in the RFP.

31. Are electronic signatures acceptable on the relevant forms and documents to be submitted?

A: Electronic signatures are acceptable.

32. Is CabLink a 3rd party software that the City of Raleigh is using? If so, can you provide information and/or a description of its functionality?

A: No, CabLink is the project name for the City's in-cab technology initiative.

33. Can you provide the existing or preferred manufacturers of the tablets and cameras that could be used on the vehicles?

A: The City may provide Android-based tablets with a customizable architecture; but it is not identifying a required or preferred tablet or camera manufacturer at this stage. Proposers should describe their hardware compatibility requirements, supported camera and tablet options, and any limitations or assumptions. Additional hardware-specific information may be discussed during discovery with vendors selected for interviews.

34. Will API integration services requiring custom development be handled by the City of Raleigh, or provided by bidder?

A: Custom API integration services may be provided by the proposer, the City, or through a shared implementation approach depending on the integration scope, system ownership, and technical requirements. Proposers should describe their available integration services, assumptions, required City responsibilities, API documentation, estimated level of effort, and any costs (such as billable hours) associated with custom development.

35. Can you provide a MMY and VIN list of all vehicles?

A: The City does not intend to provide VIN-level vehicle information at this stage. Additional vehicle-specific information, including year, make, model, or VIN where necessary, may be provided with vendors selected for further evaluation or award.

Categories and counts are as follows: Approximately 60 Automated Side Loaders and 40 Rearend Loaders are the bulk of the department's fleet. There are other vehicles including RL PUP (8), Knuckleboom (3), and Ford F550 (4) trucks that may require their own configuration.

36. Component A – Equipment Provision and Installation - Identify any limitations, required adapters, or loss of functionality if integrating with existing equipment.

a. Can you provide information on the existing equipment?

A: The City will provide representative examples for a typical rear loader and a typical automated side loader to support compatibility and retrofit pricing assumptions. Existing onboard camera equipment that would be retrofitted is expected to be model year 2022 or newer for a possible total of 20 automated side loaders and 10 rearend loader trucks.

Typical ASL: 2024 Freightliner EconicSD with Safety Vision (2) 650FHD Exterior Cameras and LED7-S monitor for viewing (or similar).

Typical REL: 2022 Crane Carrier LET2-44 with Third Eye (2) AWT2020T Exterior Cameras and AWT07MLED monitor for viewing (or similar).

37. Component B – Positive Service Verification - Integration capabilities with Esri ArcGIS and Cityworks platforms, enabling the consumption of event-based service data as geospatial features linked to asset and work management workflows; data to be accessible through standard REST services or APIs compatible with ArcGIS feature layers
- a. Can information be provided on the ESRI ArcGIS and Cityworks platforms, specifically the asset and work management workflows?

A: Detailed ESRI ArcGIS and Cityworks asset and work management workflow information is not being provided at this stage. Additional system-specific details may be discussed during discovery with vendors selected for interviews. Proposers should describe their general ability to integrate with ESRI ArcGIS or Cityworks, including preferred file types, service verification records, exception records, work orders, and secure photo or video links where applicable.

38. Component C – Key Functions and Advanced Features - AI-assisted detection of contamination, cart-not-out, and placement of cart conditions using camera-based analytics, generating structured, time-stamped, and geospatially referenced event records; identify and classify container presence, absence, contamination types, and service status with associated confidence scores, and link each detection to supporting image or video evidence
- a. What is the confidence score based on? Is it the AI detection's confidence, or otherwise?

A: The confidence score refers primarily to the AI model's confidence in the detected condition, such as container presence, absence, contamination type, placement condition, or service status. Proposers should explain whether the score is based only on computer vision detection or whether it also incorporates supporting factors such as image quality, GPS/address match confidence, lift or actuator signals, route sequence, timestamp, or other metadata. The City expects proposers to define how confidence scores are calculated and used to determine whether a record is verified, flagged for review, or marked indeterminate.

39. Component C – Key Functions and Advanced Features - Voice command for hands-free operation of key functions (photo capture, exception marking) in high-noise trucks.
- a. Can you provide an example of how voice commands would be used?

A: Example voice commands could include a driver saying "capture photo," "mark cart blocked," "cart not out," "contamination," or "skip stop" to create a time-stamped and location-referenced service event without interacting with a screen (via bluetooth or other control). The intent is for voice commands to support limited hands-free exception marking or evidence capture, while routine service verification remains primarily automated where feasible.

40. Component C – Key Functions and Advanced Features - Compatibility with RFID, BLE, or similar sensor technologies.

a. Can you expand on your RFID, BLE, and sensor technologies and their use case(s)?

A: The City is interested in understanding RFID, BLE, and related sensor technologies where they support practical municipal use cases, but specific requirements may be further refined during discovery. Potential use cases may include container or asset tracking in dense service areas such as downtown districts, driver or vehicle access identification, actuator or lift-event validation, and environmental or temperature monitoring where applicable. Proposers should describe supported technologies, required hardware, operational benefits, limitations, integration requirements, and any recommended use cases that would add value to the City.

41. Component C – Key Functions and Advanced Features - Reporting of false positive / negative detection rates as well as aggregate accuracy-

a. Would the false positive detections be cross-checked manually? If so, would this be done by the City of Raleigh, or as a service from the provider?

A: The City expects designated City staff to be trained on this review process and anticipates that supervisor spot audits will occur on a recurring basis to ensure the tool's effectiveness. Internal GIS will also work to automate the validation of available records against route completion data on a regular basis. Where certain locations or service conditions repeatedly produce false positives, false negatives, or indeterminate records, operator feedback may be used to identify patterns, refine address-matching logic, and support model improvement.

42. Regarding 4.1.4, what is the existing system you would be looking to retrofit? How many cameras are on each vehicle type and what are the camera placements to ensure proper integration?

A: The City will provide representative examples for a typical rear loader and a typical automated side loader to support compatibility and retrofit pricing assumptions. These are only hopper and rear cameras plus the monitor. Existing onboard camera equipment that would be retrofitted is expected to be model year 2022 or newer for a possible total of 20 automated side loaders and 10 rearend loader trucks.

Typical ASL: 2024 Freightliner EconicSD with Safety Vision (2) 650FHD Exterior Cameras and LED7-S monitor for viewing (or similar).

Typical REL: 2022 Crane Carrier LET2-44 with Third Eye (2) AWT2020T Exterior Cameras and AWT07MLED monitor for viewing (or similar).

43. For #3 on the excel sheet, can you specify the exact camera placements you require on each type of truck/vehicle to ensure we provide the desired 360-degree views?

A: The city would like the option to customize configuration based on cost. The most advanced configuration would be a six camera configuration for the automated side loader: cab-forward, house-side, street-side, hopper, and rear. The rearend loader and PUP configuration would be five cameras: cab-forward, house-side, street-side, and rear.

44. Do you plan to perform automatic file download by wi-fi and/or cellular?

A: Yes, the City anticipates that automated file transfer may occur through Wi-Fi, cellular, or a combination of both, depending on system design, vehicle connectivity, file size, operational needs, and cost. Proposers should describe their recommended approach for automatic upload/download of photos, video, metadata, software updates, and system logs, including bandwidth requirements, offline buffering, retry logic, security controls, and any cellular data cost assumptions.

45. Do you plan to perform live viewing remotely? If so, do you have an existing wi-fi or cellular data connection on the vehicles? If not, does vendor need to provide cellular data plan?

A: Yes, the City anticipates remote live viewing may be a desired capability. The City does not currently have an existing dedicated Wi-Fi or cellular data connection on the vehicles for this purpose, so proposers should describe any required connectivity, bandwidth, hardware, and data plan assumptions. The City is open to the vendor providing cellular service or the City providing connectivity if that approach is more cost-effective and operationally feasible.

46. If you have an existing cellular data plan on the vehicles we can leverage, who is your provider?

A: The City does not currently have an existing dedicated Wi-Fi or cellular data connection on the vehicles for this purpose, so proposers should describe any required connectivity, bandwidth, hardware, and data plan assumptions.

Kathleen Mitchell
Supervisor Business Services

SIGN BELOW AND RETURN THIS ADDENDUM WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

Proposer Name & Company: _____ **Date:** _____

Signature: _____ **Title:** _____