



CHARLOTTE

Department of Contracting and Procurement

Addendum # 3	Electronic Monitoring Services RFP# 269-2026-227
--------------	---

To: All Prospective Vendors

Date: 10/05/2026

Subject: Addendum 3 – RFP# 269-2026-227 Electronic Monitoring Services. Modification, Questions & Answers.

Please note:

Though the CMPD does not currently use "victim devices, radio frequency (RF) tracking units, or DV Equipment" the Charlotte Cooperative Purchasing Alliance included them as part of the solicitation so they would be available to any Participating Public Agencies who may want them. These devices will not be required for any demonstrations or field testing.

Item #	Form	Modification
1	Form K.- Requirements Matrix Electronic Monitoring Services	Please see the revised "K. Requirements Matrix_Electronic Monitoring Services" in this addendum. Companies should use the "K. Requirements Matrix_Electronic Monitoring Services+V2_10.05.2026" with a revision date of October 5,2026.

Item #	Title	Questions	Answers
1	Current Program Size	What is CMPD's current average daily EM population, and what is the breakdown by device/technology type?	346
2	Current Vendor	Who is CMPD's current electronic monitoring provider, and what equipment and software are currently being used?	See current contract at link below: OMNILINK Charlotte Cooperative Purchasing Alliance
3	Current Pricing	What are CMPD's current daily rates by device or service type?	See current contract at link below: OMNILINK Charlotte Cooperative Purchasing Alliance
4	Historical Volumes	What were the average and peak numbers of active monitored participants during the past 12 months?	Average: 346 Peak: 393
5	Lost/Damaged Equipment Responsibility	Who is financially responsible for lost, damaged, or stolen equipment - the agency, participant, or provider?	Our current contract allows a certain amount to be lost. The participant is ultimately responsible if they intentionally damage or take the device off and we cannot locate it. We charge them criminally, but it is up to the court to order them to pay.

6	Loss History	How many devices were lost, damaged, or stolen during each of the past three years?	2026 – 0 2025 – 1 2024 - 9
7	Evidence Equipment	a) Approximately how many devices are retained as evidence annually, b) and what is the average retention period?	a) See Amendment #1 Item #5. b) Anywhere from 6 months to a year. This varies and depends on the type of case it is being held for evidence.
8	Inventory Requirement	Please clarify how the required 20% no-cost inventory and the referenced 30% evidence/shelf-stock allowance are calculated.	See Amendment #1 Item #5
9	Enrollment/Installation	Who is expected to perform participant enrollment, equipment installation, removal, and equipment exchanges—CMPD personnel or the awarded provider?	See Amendment #1 Item #3 See Amendment #1 Item #12 See Amendment #1 Item #23
10	24/7 Monitoring	Who is responsible for reviewing and responding to alerts 24/7—CMPD, the provider, or both?	CMPD
11	Live Operator Notifications	Please clarify what services are required under the provision requiring live-operator notification for critical alerts such as tampers and exclusion-zone violations.	See Amendment #1 Item #16 See Amendment #1 Item #36
12	Critical Alert Responses	Is there a required response time, escalation sequence, or acknowledgment standard for critical alerts?	Immediate response, call the EM hotline first, send email to the EM email list, send a text message to all EM personnel, call the EM supervisor.
13	Victim Notification	How many domestic-violence victim tracking/notification devices are currently in use, and how many are anticipated under the new contract?	See Amendment #1 Item #37
14	Victim Notification	Please clarify the required victim-notification workflow, including required notification methods, acknowledgment, escalation, and law-enforcement notification.	See Amendment #1 Item #37
15	Victim Technology	Must the victim use a dedicated tracking device, or may the requirement be satisfied through a smartphone/mobile application or other approved technology?	See Amendment #1 Item #37
16	System Integration	What specific CMPD, City, court, or other systems must interface with the awarded provider's electronic monitoring platform?	See Amendment #1 Item #4 See Amendment #1 Item #25 See Amendment #1 Item #26
17	Interface Specifications	Will CMPD provide API, web service, database, staging table, CSV/JSON, or other technical specifications for each required interface?	See Amendment #1 Item #4 See Amendment #1 Item #25 See Amendment #1 Item #26

18	Integration Responsibility	Who will be responsible for developing, testing, and maintaining each side of the required system interfaces?	See Amendment #1 Item #4 See Amendment #1 Item #25 See Amendment #1 Item #26
19	Court Data	What system will provide court dates, charges, judge, courtroom, and related court information to the electronic monitoring platform?	We do not pull in any court data into the electronic monitoring platform.
20	Historical Data Migration	Will the awarded provider be required to migrate historical offender and tracking data from the incumbent system? If so, how many years of data must be migrated?	Yes, 2 to 5 years of data.
21	Implementation Date	What is the anticipated contract effective date, implementation period, and required operational go-live date?	The required operational go-live date must occur prior to the current contract expiration date of August 30, 2027, with sufficient time for transition, testing, and post-go-live stabilization.
22	Incumbent Transition	What transition period will be allowed for moving active participants from the incumbent provider to the awarded provider?	About a month to two months.
23	Training	a) Approximately how many CMPD users will require training, b) and at how many locations will on-site training be required?	a) See Amendment #1 Item #29 b) Only one site at the Law Enforcement Center.
24	Two-Way Communication	Must the required intercom/two-way communication capability be physically integrated into the ankle-worn device, or may equivalent integrated communication technology satisfy the requirement?	yes
25	Data Delivery	For the API/CSV/JSON requirement, does CMPD prefer real-time API connectivity over scheduled file delivery, and what is the intended receiving system?	See Amendment #1 Item #25 See Amendment #1 Item #26 Preference for API/JSON. The intended receiving system is an Oracle Operational Data Store
26	Crime Analysis	What CMPD system or database will Crime Analysis use to perform the required proximity searches, ad-hoc SQL queries, or SSRS reporting?	Crime Analysis will use both ad-hoc SQL queries and SSRS reporting on the data provided via the API or scheduled file delivery
27	Field Testing Duration	How long will the equipment/software field-testing period last after shortlist notification?	About a week
28	Field Testing Scoring	Will any field-testing criteria be pass/fail, and will scoring weights or testing protocols be provided before testing begins?	Scoring weights will not be provided.
29	Participant Billing	Will all monitoring charges be invoiced to the City/participating agency, or will the awarded provider ever be required to bill or collect fees directly from monitored participants?	City/CMPD

30	Program Changes	Does CMPD anticipate any significant changes in program size, staffing, monitoring practices, or technology mix during the initial contract term?	As of today, no
31	Incumbent Data/Equipment	Will the incumbent provider be required to cooperate with data migration and active-participant transition to the new provider?	Yes
32	Current Vendor	Who is expected to perform participant enrollment, equipment installation, removal, and equipment exchanges—CMPD personnel or the awarded provider?	CMPD EM personnel
33	Reference RFP Section 5. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.	"Proposals will be assessed to determine the most comprehensive, competitive and best value solution for the City based on, but not limited to, the criteria below. The City reserves the right to modify the evaluation criteria or waive portions thereof. Proposals will be evaluated on the following major categories: A. Qualifications and Experience; B. Proposed Solution and Approach; C. Cost Effectiveness and Value; D. CCPA Plan Certification; E. Acceptance of the Terms of the Contract. F. Interviews and Demonstrations; G. Equipment Field Testing Results Q. Will there be weighted scoring for each of the evaluation categories? If so, would the Agency please provide those corresponding values per category.	Scoring weights will not be provided.
34	Re 3.3.1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	6. System shall utilize reusable straps (if they have not been severed) with a variety of ankle sizes available. Q. Most contemporary GPS ankle monitoring devices now use straps that are designed for single use and are easily cut to fit with no required specially designed tools for cutting or installation. Requiring reusable, no-cut straps is unduly restrictive and may prevent the City of Charlotte and CCPA from considering of some of today's most advanced ankle-worn GPS monitoring technology. Will the Agency please consider modifying this requirement to permit alternate strap solutions for the one-piece GPS monitors?	Yes, the City will consider alternate strap solutions.
35	Re 3.3.1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	Would a light-colored or reflective device label satisfy the requirement that the system be brightly colored or equipped	Yes, a reflective device label is acceptable.

		with reflectors to make lost monitors easier to locate in dark conditions?	
36	R13-SOFT-11 Shall not allow for deletion of historical notes created by users, unless logged in under administrator role.	Would the City consider revising this requirement to permit an administrator to submit a formal request to the Service Provider for the removal of a historical note, rather than allowing administrators to delete notes directly? Industry best practices generally prohibit historical notes from being edited or deleted to preserve the integrity of the audit trail.	Agreed, we should not be able to edit or delete Historical data.
37	3.3.16. SOFTWARE MAPS Shall update maps every 90 days at a minimum or allow the software application to be configured to use various map sources to include Google maps, Bing, etc.	Would the City consider revising this requirement to acknowledge that device manufacturers and service providers do not control the frequency of map updates? Map updates are managed by the third-party mapping provider, and update frequency may vary by location, with urban areas generally updated more frequently than rural areas.	No
38	3.3.21. REPORTING - SHALL PROVIDE MINIMUM REPORTS NEEDED BY CMPD LISTED BELOW #9 Shall be capable of generating custom reports as Core Requirement by the City within 3 business days of a request.	Would the City consider revising this requirement to allow up to ten (10) business days to develop custom reports? This timeframe would allow sufficient time for development, testing, verification, and City review of sample reports to ensure they meet CMPD's operational needs.	No
39	R18-RPT-8 Allow for Crime Analysis to run custom reports against all data captured whether handled via ad-hoc SQL queries or structured SSRS reports, real time.	Would the City consider changing Requirement R18-RPT-8 from a Core Requirement to a High-Priority Requirement, since this type of real-time custom reporting is not currently provided to the City?	To clarify, Crime Analysis will run these custom reports against the data provided via the API or scheduled file delivery
40	R13-SOFT-6 Shall provide ease of use for adding/deleting new employee(s) within the mobile application and browser-based application. Bulk loads and automated loads are preferable.	Would the City consider revising Requirement R13-SOFT-6 to require the ability to add and delete employees only through the browser-based application and remove this requirement from the mobile application? Mobile applications are generally not designed to support administrative user-management functions of this nature.	Agreed, A mobile application to add and delete employees is not required.
41	#26 Describe in detail your method to	Would the City please clarify Requirement #26 regarding management and	N/A

	supply management and analytical reports that would aid in the development and modification of parking related policy?	analytical reports for developing and modifying parking-related policy? This requirement does not appear to be applicable to the scope of this electronic monitoring RFP.	Unable to find this requirement or any mention of “modifying parking related policy” in the Requirements Matrix or the RFP??
42	#27 Provide examples of easy-to-use dashboards and historical and/or real-time views of curb lane activity? (Is this from another RFP?)	Would the City please clarify Requirement #27 concerning dashboards and historical or real-time views of curb-lane activity? This requirement does not appear applicable to the scope of this electronic monitoring RFP.	N/A Unable to find this requirement or any mention of “curb-lane activity” in the Requirements Matrix or the RFP?? Vendor asking this question included in title, “(Is this from another RFP?).”
43	Appendix 2 - Participating Public Agencies	Of the approximately 700 agencies listed on the 18 pages of RFP “Appendix 2- Participating Public Agencies”, how many of those agencies are presently purchasing electronic monitoring services via the cooperative agreement associated with this RFP? And how much annual revenue is generated from those participating agencies accessing electronic monitoring services via that contract?	This information is not available.
44	Reusable Straps	Requirement R1-GN-6 states that the system “shall utilize reusable straps (if they have not been severed) with a variety of ankle sizes available. ” Would the Agency consider modifying or broadening this requirement to permit alternative strap designs or attachment methods that provide comparable security, reliability, fit, and functionality but may not utilize reusable straps?	Yes, the City will consider alternate strap solutions.
45	Audible Alert	Requirement R1-GN-14 states that the system “shall have an intercom with a verbal alert,” can the Agency clarify whether this requirement applies specifically to the GPS bracelet or to another component of the electronic monitoring system? Since this may unnecessarily limit competition as it’s geared towards a specific product, would the Agency consider removing or revising it to allow alternative technologies that provide equivalent functionality but do not have an audible alarm?	We would consider this if the offender does not have to carry a second device, including a cellphone. It is easy to maintain one device and cannot force offenders to carry multiple devices. Please clarify this question.
46	Due Date Extension	So that vendors have adequate time to respond to requirements as questions are answered, would the City please extend the RFP due date by two weeks?	See Addendum #2, Due Date changed to October 28, 2026.

47	Attachment 1 – Pricing Worksheet	Please confirm whether Offerors may add supplemental pricing lines or an attachment to the required Pricing Worksheet when necessary to accurately reflect proposed solution components, while leaving the City's required pricing form intact.	yes
48	Current Contracted Pricing	In response to Question #31, CMPD confirmed that a daily rate applies to spare inventory above the allotted allowance. Please provide the current daily rate or clarify whether Offerors should propose their own rate for inventory exceeding the allowance.	They have to provide that to us and not us providing this to them.
49	Attachment I – Pricing Worksheet	Will the Agency allow respondents the flexibility to modify or re-create the pricing form to accurately reflect all proposed costs, including additional line-item pricing for solutions that involve more than one device?	Yes, however, we prefer that the original format be followed as closely as possible to support clear and consistent pricing comparisons.

In order to constitute a complete proposal response, you must acknowledge receipt of this and all addenda by responding to the acknowledgment in the City's Procurement Portal.

Any Bidder not acknowledging receipt of an issued addendum may not be considered.

In the event additional changes or clarifications to this RFP are warranted, all Vendors are responsible for monitoring the Procurement Portal for additional addenda.

We appreciate your interest in doing business with the City and look forward to receiving a proposal from your company.

Sincerely,

Tim Hawkins
Procurement Agent Senior