

RF – Vendor Questions

1. Can you please confirm how many POS and/or card reader devices are currently in use across departments, or how many are expected to be needed as part of this engagement?

6

2. Do you have available data on the number of transactions currently processed via phone or IVR?

Not currently using IVR

3. The RFP references both City-absorbed and customer-paid fee models, and the City's website notes a 3% service fee on credit card payments starting July 1, 2025. Can you clarify if the City currently uses one model across all departments, or if there is a mix of both?

We are in the process of implementing that. Currently, we manually calculate 3.% at the register. Civic rec and building has it engaged through Elavon/Accela/Civic Rec.

4. Is there any plan to continue or expand a blended approach going forward?

We want to pass the 3% card fee to the customer.

5. What types of integrations are expected between the City's other vendors such as Tyler Munis, Accela, and Civic Rec?

The City expects seamless integration between the selected payment solution and its core systems, including Tyler Munis (ERP), Accela (permitting), and CivicRec (recreation). These integrations should allow for real-time or near real-time data exchange, automated reconciliation, and accurate posting of payments by department, bill type, and tender type. The goal is to reduce manual entry, improve reporting accuracy, and streamline cross-departmental workflows.

6. What are the City's key goals and use cases related to kiosks?

Mainly for Utility payment, permit payment, parking pass, swimming pool pass, etc.

7. What is the City's current settlement timeline for each of the payables in scope?

Settlement timelines currently vary by payment type and channel.

8. What are the City's expectations surrounding deployment? When do they want to have services live?

We gave a rough timeline in the RFP

9. Are all departments required to switch to the new provider? If not, which departments are planning to switch?

We are not requiring all departments to switch. We require Accela to be able to connect. We want the other platforms to be able to communicate with the new system.

10. What has the current incumbent done to increase digital adoption in order to simplify agency operations and reduce costs?

The City of Martinez does not currently have a digital payment processing incumbent. This RFP represents our effort to implement a comprehensive, integrated solution to increase digital adoption, improve customer experience, and streamline agency operations moving forward.

11. What marketing services does the incumbent offer?

The City of Martinez does not currently have a payment processing vendor providing marketing services, but we are open to exploring marketing and user adoption support as part of the proposed solution.

12. What would you change about your current client service and support?

While Munis provides basic support, we would like to improve response times, reduce the need for internal troubleshooting, and have more proactive support—especially during implementation, reconciliation, and technical integration across departments. We're seeking a vendor that offers more hands-on client service, training, and consistent follow-up.

13. What would you change about your online portal experience? Are there any additional features you would like to have?

The City's current online portal is not user-friendly and lacks key features that support a positive customer experience. There are limited payment options, no ability to send payment reminders, and no support for text notifications or mobile-first design. We are looking for a more intuitive, accessible, and flexible solution that includes features such as guest checkout, recurring payments, email/text reminders, and support for multiple payment methods across channels.

14. To provide an informative and transparent customer experience, is the City interested in providing usage/consumption data within the customer portal for utility accounts?

Yes, Munis currently provides that through the payment portal

15. How does the agency handle support requests from residents/customers navigating the payment portal today? Is the agency interested in complimentary customer support via phone/email?

Currently, City staff assist residents by guiding them through the payment process or directing them to the appropriate resources. While we are open to complimentary customer support via phone or email, our primary goal is to implement a portal that is intuitive and easy to use—minimizing the need for customer service intervention. A well-designed, self-service platform is a priority, but having vendor-provided support available as a backup would be beneficial.

16. How are the services in scope for this opportunity funded today?

The services in scope for this opportunity are currently funded through department operating budgets and user fees. Each department is responsible for covering costs related to their respective payment operations. The City is exploring solutions that improve efficiency and customer experience while remaining cost-effective across all departments.

17. Is the County interested in a vendor-hosted web payment solution that incorporates value-added functionality such as user-managed profiles and flexible payment options (e.g., AutoPay, Payment Plans), and the ability to host numerous departments/services through a single experience?

We are not county.

Yes, the City is very interested in a vendor-hosted web payment solution that includes value-added functionality such as user-managed profiles, AutoPay, payment plans, and the ability to support multiple departments and services through a single, unified user experience. Flexibility, ease of use, and the ability to scale across departments are key priorities for this project.

18. The Q&A deadline is within only a few days of the submission deadline. In order to provide the most informative response for the City and have sufficient time to review all Q&A, we are requesting a 1-2 week extension to the current bid deadline.

We are not offering extensions as we have a tight deadline to get this implemented

19. How many terminals does the City require for in-person/POS payments?

We have a total of 6 terminals

20. In Section V. Cost Proposal, the City provides a transaction receipt count and dollar volumes for Online Utility Billing, as well as a table with the transaction count and volumes for Current City Data. Can the City clarify what payment channels (POS, phone, etc.) are included in the Current City Data table?

These include in-person, Elockbox, Check Lockbox, ACH, and online payments.

21. What other City departments are in scope for this RFP outside of Utilities, Permits, and Parks/Rec? Can the City please provide the transaction details for these additional departments?

Those 3 departments are what we are looking for

We wanted to see people paying Tax payments as well, TOT and Franchise Fees. Those are roughly (5-10) quarterly payments.

22. Can the City provide additional clarification on the operating system platform requested in Question 55?

This is regarding the kiosk that would be provided to the City. If there is a Kiosk option, what type of operating system will it be using.

23. In the Current City Data table, what types of payments are included in the "Miscellaneous Revenue" section? What other departments does this include?

Misc Revenue is: Everything other than Utility billing

Tax Rev

Building

Engineering

Comm/Dev

Recreation

Parking permit

24. It appears the City is also looking for a cashiering solution based on Question 30 and others. Is that correct, cashiering is a need outside of POS terminals?

Yes we are looking into cashiering in addition to other inquiries

We want a one-stop shop for online transactions, in-house transactions, and receiving other platforms (Accela and Civic Rec) information as well.

25. Does the City currently have kiosks in place? If yes, who is the current provider? If no, how many standalone kiosks does the City require?

No, we are looking for install 2 kiosks.

26. Will you share the City's anticipated transaction volume over a three-year term referred to in Part V, Section E "Summary of Total Costs"?

You should be able to estimate this data from what we have already provided.

27. Could you please confirm the City's preferred format for pricing? Should we follow the bullets outlined in Cost Proposal Sections B, C, D, and E, use the format provided in Attachment A (Example BAFO), or is it acceptable to submit our own pricing format?

We do prefer that format; however, most importantly, we want to see a clear and simplified pricing structure.