



Addendum No. 1
City of Coquitlam
RFP No. 26-049

Pay Parking Mobile Payment Application
Issue Date: May 27, 2026
Total Page Count: 8

Proponents shall note the following amendments to the RFP documents:

REPLACE

R1) REPLACE

The following dates have been extended as part of an extension request. The entirety of "Key Dates" is replaced with the following:

KEY DATES

RFP Issue Date	Friday, May 8, 2026
Deadline for Questions Send questions to: bid@coquitlam.ca referencing the RFP name and number.	12:00 PM (local time) Tuesday, May 26, 2026
Submission Deadline	2:00 PM (local time) Monday, June 15, 2026

ADDITIONS

ADD 1) Appendix C - Pay Parking Revenue by Machine 2025, has been added to City website to form part of the Appendices and Scope of Work.

QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

- Q1. Do you have any data around the number of transactions and the average transaction value?
A1. See ADD 1. There were 7,912 transactions by Pay Parking Mobile Payment Application in 2025. Unfortunately, the City does not have further data to share.
- Q2. Does the City have a pre-defined budget for this project?
A2. No. The City does not have a pre-defined budget. As per Section 5.2 h) Signage Contribution, the City's expectation is that Proponents to fund elements related to custom signage, based on the current parking inventory and subject to

review if the number of parking zones or paystations changes during the Contract term. In the Financial Section, Proponents to fully disclose and state all Cost Scenarios to the City or end users, no additional fees, charges, or surcharges of any kind will be applied beyond those identified without prior written approval of the City.

Q3. Is there an opportunity for an additional acquirer to be added or will only Chase and Moneris be considered at this time?

A3. No additional acquirer to be added at this time.

Q4. The RFP references a 30-day implementation timeline. Can you confirm whether this is a firm requirement or if there is flexibility to propose a more realistic timeline based on the actual integration and project scope?

A4. As per Section 5.2 a) Deployment and Implementation, the City's preference is to have full deployment of the solution within thirty (30) calendar days of Contract Execution. Proponents to provide rationale in their Proposal if more time is required.

Q5. Could you provide more details about the expected integration work, especially regarding the "field ticket" component? Are there technical documents or further specifications available?

A5. Proponents to have the necessary API's and integration tools to integrate with the City's existing and future systems including: Genetec for municipal bylaw enforcement technology using Automated License Plate Recognition software which provides the information on how to validate pay parking for Bylaw Enforcement Officers. FieldTicket by Mpowered (mpowered.biz) for the City's Bylaw Officers to issue parking tickets. The ability to push parking violation information to FieldTicket is considered an added operational benefit, but not a requirement.

Q6. How many vendors does the City anticipate selecting or keeping as part of this Pay Parking Mobile Payment Application contract? Is the intention to award to a single provider or multiple providers and if so How many?

A6. As per Section 5.1 Background, the City intends to transition from a single-provider mobile payment application and transition to a model that supports multiple providers accessible through a unified interface for the purpose of increasing user choice and convenience based on regional and local available payment providers.

Q7. Are we correct to assume that the single-mobile payment application with “unified interface” refers to back office administrative staff and NOT a public-facing interface featuring all vendor options?

A7. Correct. Each individual Proponent Pay Parking Mobile Payment Application to be used with unified interface elements like same zone numbering and back end integration for reporting and enforcement.

Q8. Is “termination” under Application Requirements/Core Functionality and essential feature?

A8. Proponents may elect in their Proposal to respond with why this feature would not be provided and how they would be prepared to resolve the need for termination of a session, such as cancelling a wrong plate number entered.

Q9. What is the specific dollar value or percentage of current mobile payment convenience/transaction fees charged to parkers? What is the City’s current annual mobile payment revenue? What is the City’s current annual mobile payment transaction volume?

A9. 2025 Parking revenues were approximately \$325,000, of which approximately 20% were mobile payment transactions.

Q10. Does the City have any preferred payment processors beyond Chase Paymentech and Moneris? How are current convenience fees structured (flat fee, percentage-based, tiered, etc.)?

A10. No. At this time, the City will only consider Chase Paymentech and Moneris as payment processors.

Q11. Who is the City’s current mobile payment provider? Who is the City’s current pay station provider? What models and configurations of pay stations are currently deployed?

A11. The City’s current mobile payment provider is Flobird. The current paystation provider is Precise and they operate the Strada DG7 and 4x Strada Touch models. The City anticipates issuing a separate RFP 26-048 Pay Parking Stations in 2026, which may result in a change to the City’s current mobile paystation vendor or models.

Q12. What is the anticipated contract award date or timeframe? Does the City have a targeted go-live date for the new solution?

A12. The City anticipates award by the end of July 2026, with implementation and onboarding activities to occur thereafter. The target for the new mobile payment applications to be fully operational by the end of September 2026.

Q13. What are the City’s current parking rates (by location/type, if applicable)? Does the City anticipate any changes to parking rates or pricing structures during the contract term? If yes, please outline those changes.

A13. The City’s Parking Rates range typically from \$1.00 per hour to \$4.00 per day maximum with some exceptions. The rates and locations are Schedule “F” of the [Fees & Charges Bylaw No.5484](#) see Figure 1 below.

The City anticipates potential changes to parking rates, locations, and pricing structures during the contract term following the completion of the Curbside Management Strategy.

FIGURE 1

Schedule “F” to Bylaw No. 5484, 2025 Engineering & Public Works Department Fees & Charges

Transportation Infrastructure Services and Products	Fees
On Street Parking (Pay Parking Zones) City Center (North of Guildford) - Mon-Sat - 8am to 6pm Fee per hour - see Note 6	\$ 1.00
On Street Parking (Pay Parking Zones) in City Center (South of Guildford) - Mon-Sat - 8am to 6pm Fee per hour - see Note 6	\$ 1.25
On Street Parking (Pay Parking Zones - Park & Ride) - Mon-Sat - 8am to 6pm Fee per day-- see Note 6	\$ 4.00
Evergreen Cultural Centre (ECC) Lot (1205 Pinetree Way) - Mon-Sat - 8am to 6pm Fee per hour - Daily Max 4 hrs	\$ 1.00
Fee per hour - EV Stalls - Daily Max 2 hrs	\$ 1.00
City Centre Aquatic Complex (CCAC) Lot - (1210 Pinetree Way) - Mon-Sat - 8am to 6pm Fee per hour - Daily Max 4 hrs	\$ 1.00
Fee per hour - EV Stalls - Daily Max 2 hrs	\$ 1.00
Pine Tree Community Centre (PTCC) Lot - (160 Pinetree Way) - Mon-Sat - 7:30am to 9pm Fee per hour - Daily Max 4 hrs	\$ 1.00
Fee per day	\$ 4.00
Lincoln Station Park & Ride Lot (3045 Lincoln) - Mon-Sat - 8am to 6pm Fee per hour	\$ 1.00
Fee per day	\$ 4.00
Lafarge Lake - Douglas Station Park and Ride Lot (3038 Guildford) Fee per hour	\$ 1.00
Fee per day	\$ 4.00
Burquitlam Station Park & Ride Parkade (Betty Allard YMCA) - Mon-Fri (5am to 2am) and Sat (7am to 1am) Fee per hour	\$ 2.00
Fee per day - 8am to 6pm	\$ 5.00
Fee per evenings - 6pm to 1am	\$ 3.00
Annual Residents Facility Parking Pass (City owned parking & limited parking) - see Note 6	\$ 30.00
Annual Residents Facility Parking Pass Replacement or Transfer - see Note 6	\$ 15.00
Macquabeak Park Lot (5 Burbridge St) - Mon-Sun - 24 Hrs/Day Payable for daily boat launch parking -see Note 6	\$ 11.50

Q14. How many mobile payment signs are currently deployed throughout the City? Will vendors be responsible for signage installation, replacement, or ongoing maintenance? Are there any planned expansions or changes to parking zones or pay stations that proponents should be aware of?

A14. The City will be responsible for signage related to the Mobile Payment Application System, in consultation with providers and taking into account best practices for location and design. Contractors will not be responsible for signage installation replacement. Potential expansion of pay parking zones are anticipated following the completion of the City's Curbside Management Strategy.

Q15. Section 5.2(d) (iii) requires proponents to provide estimated annual revenue projections based on City-provided data. Could the City please provide historical monthly or annual transaction volume counts and gross parking revenue totals specifically generated via the mobile channel over the past 12–24 months? What is the current percentage split of transactions between physical paystations and the incumbent mobile payment application?

A15. See A 9 for Annual Revenue. Projections are for City annual budget estimation only.

Q16. Are all 900 parking spaces operating under a standardized hourly rate, or do specific lots/zones feature varying rate structures, peak hours, or daily/monthly maximums?

A16. See A 13.

Q17. Under the "Contractor as Merchant of Record" model, is the Contractor permitted to pass through Visa/Mastercard/Amex corporate and international interchange differentials into the convenience fee, or must the convenience fee remain completely flat across all card types?

A17. If the Contractor is acting as MOR, then the convenience/transaction fee shall include all costs associated with the Services, including payment processing, interchange differentials, and operating costs. Any convenience/transaction fees charged to the customer must remain a flat fee, regardless of card type and must be clearly disclosed prior to payment.

Q18. Please confirm whether interviews, presentations, or demonstrations will be required as part of the evaluation process, and if so, provide details on evaluation criteria, format, duration, and agenda.

A18. Refer to Sections 4.3 Information Meeting and 4.7 Evaluation Criteria of the RFP documents. The City reserves the right to conduct interviews, presentations, demonstrations, or clarification meetings as part of the evaluation process.

Q19. Please confirm whether proponents are expected to respond in detail to all requirements in Section 5 (Scope of Services), or if responses provided through the Proposal Submission Form (with supporting attachments as needed) are sufficient.

A19. Proponents are expected to respond to the requirements identified in the Proposal Submission Form and provide sufficient supporting detail and attachments as necessary to demonstrate compliance with the Scope of Services and evaluation requirements.

Q20. Please confirm whether proponents may include a bespoke cover letter with their Proposal.

A20. Yes, Proponents may include a cover letter as part of their Proposal.

Q21. Please confirm whether proponents are expected to include resumes or profiles for key personnel as part of the Proposal, and if so, whether these should be included within the Proposal Submission Form or as an appendix.

A21. Proponents may include resumes or profiles for key personnel as part of their Proposal. These may be included within the Proposal Submission Form or as an appendix.

Q22. Please confirm how many proponents the City intends to award under this multi-provider model.

A22. As per Section 5.1 Background, the City intends to transition from a single-provider mobile payment application and transition to a model that supports multiple providers accessible through a unified interface for the purpose of increasing user choice and convenience based on regional and local available payment providers.

Q23. The RFP references a “multi-provider environment” with a requirement for a “unified user experience across providers.” Could the City please clarify what is meant by “unified interface,” and confirm whether the successful proponent is expected to provide or manage this interface, or whether this will be procured separately?

A23. As outlined in Section 5.1 Background, the City intends to transition to a multi-provider mobile payment environment that supports interoperability and a consistent user experience across providers, including common zone numbering and integration with enforcement and reporting systems. Proponents are not expected to provide or procure a separate public-facing unified application interface.

Q24. Please provide a copy of the formula that will be used to evaluate the cost proposal.

A24. Refer to Section 4.7 Evaluation Criteria of the RFP documents. The City will evaluate Financial Proposals based on the information submitted in the pricing forms and overall value to the City.

Q25. Please confirm the parking rate assumptions (i.e., hourly and daily rates) that proponents should use when completing the sample user cost scenarios in the pricing form.

A25. See Answer A 13.

Q26. Please provide enforcement hours and current parking rate structures, including hourly and daily maximums.

A26. See A 13.

Q27. The RFP requires full deployment within thirty (30) days of contract execution. Please confirm whether this timeline includes all integration, testing, and go-live activities, and whether any flexibility exists in this requirement based on City or third-party dependencies.

A27. The City's expectation is that implementation, integration, testing, and go-live activities be completed in advance of the target operational date of end of September 2026. Proponents may propose alternative timelines where justified within their Proposal.

Q28. Please confirm the anticipated timeline for proposal evaluation, award, and contract execution to support implementation planning.

A28. Anticipated award is by the end of July 2026, with contract execution to follow as soon as possible thereafter. The new mobile payment applications are expected to be operational by the end of September 2026.

Q29. Please confirm the City's preferred process for submitting exceptions to contract terms (e.g., within the Proposal Submission Form or as an appendix).

A29. Proponents should identify any exceptions, departures, or proposed amendments to the City's contract terms in their Proposal Submission Form. Any exceptions must be clearly stated. The City's terms will apply unless a departure is expressly accepted by the City in writing.

Q30. The RFP requires an annual \$1,000 signage contribution. Please confirm whether this amount applies per vendor or will be shared among all awarded vendors.

A30. The annual \$1,000 signage contribution applies per awarded vendor, per year, for the duration of the Contract term.

Q31. The RFP references TransLink-related reporting requirements. Could the City please provide additional detail on what is expected in relation to TransLink reporting, including the specific data elements, reporting formats, frequency, and any applicable standards or integration requirements?

A31. Reporting requirements related to the TransLink Parking Tax are expected to include transaction and revenue information associated with applicable off-street parking operations. Specific reporting formats and administrative requirements will be confirmed during implementation.

Q32. Could the City please provide historical data from the past 12 to 24 months regarding the current baseline metrics, including: the City's transaction volume, total annual gross parking revenue, parking occupancy, current mobile application adoption rates compared to physical paystations and average duration and transaction value of a standard parking session?

A32. Refer to ADD 1 Appendix C – Pay Parking Revenue by Machine 2025 and responses A 1, A 9, and A 13 for available historical transaction and revenue information.

Q33. Is it the City's intent to award contracts to multiple service providers simultaneously to establish this multi-provider environment, or is the City selecting a single primary contractor whose platform must natively support future external third-party plug-ins?

A33. The City may award to multiple service providers, for simultaneous operations and multi user environment.

End of Addendum No. 1

Proponents take into account the content of this Addendum in the preparation and submission of the Proposal which will form part of the Contract and should be acknowledged on the Proposal Submission Form.

Upon submitting a Proposal, Proponents are deemed to have received all addenda that are issued and posted on the City's website and considered the information for inclusion in the Proposal Submission.

Issued by:

Chris Overes
Senior Procurement Specialist
bid@coquitlam.ca