



City of Raleigh

Request for Proposals #: 274- SWS04202026Cablink-A

Title: SWS In-CAB Technology: Refuse Truck Cameras

Proposal Due Date and Time: July 8, 2026, 3:00 PM EST

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Issue Date: June 16, 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 16, 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. Number of functional components. Section 4 (Scope of Services) states that vendors may respond to "one (1) or more of the five (5) functional components," but the section then lists only three: Component A – Equipment Provision and Installation; Component B – Positive Service Verification; and Component C – Key Functions and Advanced Features. **Are there functional components missing, or are there in fact only three (3)?**

A: Section 4 should state that vendors may respond to "one (1) or more of the three (3) functional components..."

1. Cost schedules vs. components vs. cost forms. Section 2.1.6 (Cost) requires five cost schedules - Positive Service Verification; Navigation During Collection; Vehicle Health, Safety, and DVIR; Route Design and Planning; and Key Functions and Advanced Features - which match neither the three components scoped in Section 4 nor the three Proposal Cost Forms provided in Appendix I (Components A, B, and C). **Please confirm how many completed cost forms a vendor must submit with its response to RFP -A, and for exactly which components.**

A: There should be three completed cost forms for this request if responding in its entirety. Both Section 4 as well as the three Proposal Cost Forms in Appendix I are correct.

Section 2.1.6 should read:

"In a separate sealed envelope provide a minimum of six (6) complete copies of the Proposal Cost Forms and any additional itemized cost breakdown or price schedule. Three (3) cost/rebate schedules must be completed - one for each component within the Scope of Services 4.1: Equipment Provision and Installation; Positive Service Verification; and Key Functions and Advanced Features. Hourly rates shall be fully burdened to include all costs, all applicable overhead and profit (including lodging, meals, and transportation). Attach any additional pricing details."

3. Definition of "CabLink" and platform ownership. Section 4 states that "The CabLink ecosystem will connect in-cab tablets, onboard vehicle sensors... and supervisor dashboards through a centralized data management platform." **Is "CabLink" an existing system the City currently owns or operates, or the name of the overall initiative under which these solutions are being solicited?**

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

4. Is the awarded vendor expected to provide the centralized data management platform, or is there an existing City platform that proposed components must integrate into?

A: The City has not designated a required centralized data management platform for this procurement. The awarded vendor may propose a platform or component-level solution, but should clearly identify whether its system would serve as a central data layer, integrate with existing City platforms, or exchange data with City platforms and/or other vendor solutions.

5. Interoperability across components and vendors. Because vendors may respond to one or more components and components may be awarded to different vendors, **is there a designated system of record or data backbone that all components must connect to?**

A: The City has not designated a required system of record or data backbone that all components must connect to at this stage. The City uses Microsoft-based tools, including Azure, and data platforms such as Snowflake, but the final integration approach will depend on the proposed solution, technical requirements, data architecture, and associated costs. Proposers should describe their recommended integration architecture, interoperability approach, data exchange methods, and any assumptions or limitations.

6. How does the City envision data flow and responsibility for integration when components are split across 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.

7. RFP number. The cover page reads "274-SWS04202026Cablink-A," the body and mailing instructions read "274-SWS04222026Cablink-A," and the Appendix III Reference Questionnaire reads "274-SWS01022026CABLINK-A." **Please confirm the correct, official RFP number to be used on our submission package, electronic copy, and reference forms.**

A: 274-SWS04202026Cablink-A

8. "Key Functions and Advanced Features" appears as a component in both RFP -A and RFP -B, with overlapping requirements (e.g., verifiable API data exchange with Power BI and/or CityWorks, and a voice/alert feature set).

1. **For a vendor responding to both solicitations, should this component be proposed and priced once across both, or separately under each RFP?**
2. **If a vendor is awarded this component under one RFP, does that satisfy the requirement under the other?**

A: Vendors responding to both RFP-A and RFP-B should propose and price the Key Functions and Advanced Features component separately under each solicitation, unless the proposer clearly identifies a shared solution, shared cost assumption, or dependency across both proposals. An award under one RFP does not automatically satisfy requirements under the other RFP, as each solicitation will be evaluated and awarded independently based on its own scope, requirements, and use cases. Proposers should clearly identify any overlapping functionality, pricing efficiencies, implementation dependencies, or assumptions if the same platform or feature set is being proposed for both solicitations.

9. What is the current version of CityWorks implemented at the City? Online (Cloud) or installed on-premise?

A: Cityworks is installed on-premise, however it is possible that the City may switch to the online version in the near future. Please include any adjustments or necessary considerations for that transition in your response.

10. ArcGIS integration. Requirement 14.0 calls for integration with the City's Esri ArcGIS environment. To scope this accurately, please clarify:
 1. **Does the City currently expose the relevant data - e.g., addresses, carts/service points - as published ArcGIS feature-layer REST endpoints?**
 2. **Are these hosted in ArcGIS Online or ArcGIS Enterprise/Portal?**
 3. **If such endpoints do not yet exist, does the City expect the vendor to build them, or will the City provide them prior to integration?**

A: The City currently maintains the relevant data using appropriate endpoints. The expectation is that the City will provide the necessary data for a successful integration. Specific ESRI integration requirements may be discussed further during discovery meetings with proposers selected for interviews. Proposers should describe their experience integrating with these platforms, including examples of successful integrations and any assumptions or limitations.

11. CRM / customer notification system. The Purpose section cites integration with "existing CRM" and a "customer notification system" (4.2.6). **Which products/versions are these?**

A: Specific CRM and customer notification system details will not be provided at this stage and may be discussed during discovery with vendors selected for interviews. Proposers should describe their experience integrating with these platforms, including examples of successful integrations, supported data exchange methods, communication triggers, and any assumptions or limitations.

12. Will the vendor be required to provide professional services for any custom integration development under this project? If yes, please indicate whether that scope is expected to cover initial build, ongoing maintenance, or both.

A: Custom 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.

13. For cost purposes, can the City please provide the exact truck count per truck type in scope for this RFP?

1. Automated Side-Loaders
2. Rear-Loaders
3. Special-service units
 - i. PUP
 - ii. Knuckleboom
 - iii. Front-End Loader
 - iv. Split Body
 - v. Roll-Off

A: An estimate can be provided at this time. Approximately 60 Automated Side Loaders and 40 Rear-End 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. Itemized pricing should also be made available to help better understand the cost schedule.

14. Can the City specify what existing technologies/hardware may exist on the vehicles - e.g., switches, cameras (and camera locations), lift sensors/actuators on lift arms, scales, in-cab displays/tablets, GPS/telematics units, etc.? If so, please provide details such as make and model, quantity, and location, broken down by vehicle type or class where it varies.

A: The City is not providing a detailed vehicle-by-vehicle inventory of existing onboard technologies or hardware at this stage, except that Geotab is currently used for telematics. All other vehicle hardware assumptions should be treated as to be determined. Additional vehicle-specific information may be provided during discovery with vendors selected for further evaluation or award.

15. Will deployment and installation occur at a single facility, or are vehicles based across multiple yards/depots? If multiple, please identify the locations and the approximate number of vehicles at each.

A: All vehicles are located at a single facility.

16. Existing in-cab equipment. Section 4.1.5 references "existing backup and hopper cameras." Please describe the camera/hardware currently installed in the fleet (manufacturers, models/serial #, position on vehicle) and clarify whether a vendor is expected to integrate with, retrofit, or replace this 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, where present, is expected to be model year 2022 or newer. Anything older would be considered for replacement.

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).

The proposer is expected to recommend the most cost efficient and operationally stable solution based on industry standards.

17. "4.2.1. Successful automatic photo captures triggered by lift/actuator events with timestamp and GPS-linked photo record." **Based on the truck type, auto captures triggered by lift/actuators may not be available. What is the City's expectation?**

A: The City's expectation is focused on residential collection vehicles where lift, tipper, actuator, PTO, or comparable service-event signals are available, primarily automated side-loaders and rear loaders equipped with cart tippers or actuator-based collection functions. Where a specific truck type does not expose a usable lift or actuator signal, proposers should describe an alternate method for triggering service-event photo capture, such as computer vision, geofence/route-stop logic, telematics, operator exception input, or another reliable signal. The intent is to capture a timestamped and GPS-linked photo record tied to the service event, while allowing the triggering method to vary based on vehicle configuration.

18. Are the rear-load vehicles single or dual tippers?

A: Full size rear-loaders are dual tippers. PUP rear-load vehicles are only one tipper.

19. For Component C – Key Functions and Advanced Features, **does the City require a firm not-to-exceed price covering full-fleet deployment, or may the vendor price the AI/advanced features as optional pricing for a pilot phase (per 4.3.1) with full rollout contingent on meeting the 4.3.2 performance benchmarks?**

A: The vendor can provide not-to-exceed pricing for both the pilot-only option as well as the full implementation. Any associated itemized pricing should also be listed if available.

1.3 Request for Proposal (RFP) Timeline

Provided below is a list of the anticipated schedule of events related to this solicitation. The City of Raleigh reserves the right to modify and/or adjust the following schedule to meet the needs of the service. All times shown are Eastern Time (EST):

RFP Process	Date and Time
RFP Date	<i>May 15, 2026</i>
Pre-Proposal Meeting/Site-Visit (if required)	<i>N/A</i>
Deadline for Written Questions	<i>June 3, 2026</i>
City Response to Questions (anticipated)	<i>June 10, 2026</i>
Proposal Due Date and Time	<i>July 8, 2026 at 3:00 PM EDT</i>
Evaluation Meeting (anticipated)	<i>July 20, 2026</i>
Interviews (if required)	<i>Week of July 27, 2026</i>
Selection(s) Announced (tentative)	<i>August 10, 2026</i>

Kathleen Mitchell
Supervisor Business Services

SIGN BELOW AND RETURN THIS ADDENDUM WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

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

Signature: _____ **Title:** _____