



City of Raleigh

Request for Proposals #: 274- SWS04222026Cablink-B

Title: SWS In-CAB Technology: Navigation

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

City of Raleigh
Addendum 2 to RFP 274- SWS04222026Cablink-B
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. Cost schedules vs. components vs. cost forms. Section 4 scopes three components (1. Navigation During Collection; 2. Routing and GIS Integration; 3. Key Functions and Advanced Features), and Appendix I provides three Proposal Cost Forms (Components A, B, and C). However, Section 2.1.6 (Cost) requires five cost schedules – 1. Positive Service Verification; 2. Navigation During Collection; 3. Vehicle Health, Safety, and DVIR; 4. Route Design and Planning; and 5. Key Functions and Advanced Features.

Please confirm how many completed cost forms a vendor must submit with its response to RFP -B, and for exactly which components.

A: Please follow Section 4 as well as Appendix I for number of components.

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: Navigation During Collection; Routing and GIS Integration; 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.”

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 ESRI's ArcGIS platform but the final integration approach will depend on the proposed solution, technical requirements, data architecture, and associated costs.

5. 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.

6. In the Navigation spreadsheet, requirements 8.0–11.0 are repeated as 13.0–16.0 (automated progress tracking, auto-checkoff, exception dropdown, color-coded visuals). **Please confirm whether these are intentional distinct items or a duplication.**

A: That is an unintentional duplication.

7. Overlapping "Key Functions and Advanced Features" component. "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). **For a vendor responding to both solicitations, should this component be proposed and priced once across both, or separately under each RFP? a. 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.

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

A: The City currently utilizes an on-premises deployment of Cityworks. However, the City is actively evaluating a potential transition to the Cityworks Online (cloud-based) platform in the future.

Proposers should describe any considerations, dependencies, integration impacts, or additional costs associated with supporting both the current on-premises environment and a potential future migration to Cityworks Online. Solutions that can accommodate either deployment model with minimal disruption are preferred.

9. ArcGIS integration. Several requirements call for integration with the City's Esri ArcGIS environment (Navigation Req. 30 and Navigation Scope §4.3.3). To scope this accurately, please clarify:

1. **Does the City currently expose the relevant data - e.g., addresses, routes, and carts/service points - as published ArcGIS feature-layer REST endpoints?**

A: Some of the previously referenced datasets are currently hosted and accessible through GIS services. The availability and accessibility of specific datasets may vary based on business requirements, security considerations, and system architecture.

2. **Are these hosted in ArcGIS Online or ArcGIS Enterprise/Portal?**

A: The City currently utilizes a combination of GIS technologies and hosting environments. Additional details regarding the specific deployment architecture and available services may be provided during the discovery and implementation phases.

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: No. The City does not currently anticipate requiring the selected vendor to develop GIS data endpoints as part of this project.

However, proposers should describe their experience with GIS data integrations, including the use of APIs, REST services, feature services, data synchronization tools, and other common integration methods. Proposers should also identify any endpoint, service, or data-access requirements necessary to support their solution.

4. For the ongoing nightly processing of new addresses and data changes required by Navigation Req. 25.0, will updates be available through those same live endpoints, or does the City anticipate a different update mechanism (e.g., scheduled file exports)?

A: Yes. Solid Waste Services currently anticipates continuing to use its established processes for new addresses and data changes.

If a proposer recommends an alternative or enhanced update mechanism, the benefits of that approach should be clearly explained in the response and may be further discussed during the discovery phase.

10. GIS source data. Req 24.0 requires a one-time import of "all existing customer route shapefiles and layers." What is the approximate number of routes/addresses and file formats, to better scope the import?

A: The City can provide an estimate at this time to assist proposers with scoping the one-time GIS data import.

The City currently maintains approximately **320** collection routes and approximately **129,000** customer service points. Existing GIS data is primarily maintained in shapefile format and through hosted feature services.

Proposers should identify their preferred GIS data format for import, as well as any formats with which they have the most experience. Proposers should also clearly describe any data preparation requirements, assumptions, limitations, or additional costs associated with importing route shapefiles, customer service points, hosted feature services, or related GIS layers.

11. Does the City know the approximate number of centerline miles in its GIS street network? If centerline mileage isn't readily available, the segment or road-feature count would also be helpful.

A: The City can provide an estimate at this time for planning and scoping purposes. The City's GIS street network contains approximately 82,600 centerline segments, representing an estimated 5,800 centerline miles.

These figures are intended to provide proposers with a reasonable approximation of the street network size. More detailed GIS data and network information may be made available during the implementation and discovery phases.

12. Existing telematics. Req 30.0 calls for Geotab integration. Does the City already run Geotab (or another telematics platform) that we integrate with, or is that to be provided?

A: The City currently uses Geotab as its telematics platform and does not expect proposers to replace it as part of this requirement. Proposers should describe whether their solution can

integrate with Geotab, any required Marketplace/API configuration, and any associated costs or limitations.

13. 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 itemized costs (such as billable hours) associated with custom development.

14. 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.

15. Can the City specify what existing technologies/hardware 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.

16. 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.

17. Do Knuckleboom units (and the other special-service vehicles - PUP, Front-End Loader, Split Body, Roll-Off) run defined routes? If so, do they require in-cab turn-by-turn navigation, or is the navigation solution intended only for the standard residential collection fleet (automated side-loaders and rear-loaders)?

A: Yes, special-service vehicles, including Knuckleboom, PUP, Front-End Loader (FEL), Split Body, Roll-Off, and similar fleet assets, should be included in the proposed in-cab navigation solution.

While some of these vehicles operate on recurring service routes, others support ad hoc, event-driven, or on-demand work assignments that may be created or modified daily. Proposers should describe how their solution accommodates dynamic route creation, route imports, and same-day route updates for these types of operations.

If additional configuration, integration, licensing, or implementation considerations are required to support on-demand or frequently changing routes, proposers should clearly identify those requirements and any associated costs in their response.

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	May 15, 2026
Pre-Proposal Meeting/Site-Visit (if required)	N/A
Deadline for Written Questions	June 3, 2026

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:** _____