

ADDENDUM NO. 1 – June 24, 2026
Request for Proposals For
Recreation Registration Software Management System for Parks and Recreation

This addendum amends the Request for Proposals (RFP) for this project as follows:

RFI 1: Will Single Sign-On (SSO) be required at go-live? If so, please identify the identity provider (e.g., Microsoft Entra ID, Okta).

A1: The City desires Single Sign-On (SSO) capability and has identified SSO support as a technical requirement. While SSO is not currently required to be implemented at go-live, vendors should describe their SSO capabilities, supported authentication standards (e.g., SAML 2.0, OAuth 2.0, OpenID Connect), implementation approach, and any prerequisites. The City currently utilizes Microsoft technologies and may evaluate integration with Microsoft Entra ID (formerly Azure Active Directory) as part of the implementation process.

RFI 2: Are SOC 2 Type II and ISO 27001 mandatory requirements or evaluation preferences?

A2: SOC 2 Type II and ISO 27001 certifications are preferred security qualifications and will be considered during the City's evaluation of vendor cybersecurity maturity and risk management practices. Vendors that do not possess one or both certifications should provide equivalent independent third-party security assessments, certifications, or audit reports demonstrating the effectiveness of their security controls.

RFI 3: Can equivalent security certifications be accepted where ISO 27001 is not available?

A3: Yes. The City will consider equivalent independent third-party security certifications, attestations, audits, or assessments that demonstrate comparable information security governance, risk management, and control effectiveness. Vendors should clearly identify any alternative certifications and explain how they align with recognized security frameworks and industry best practices.

RFI 4: Please clarify whether penetration-test reports can be submitted as executive summaries only.

A4: Yes. The City does not require submission of full penetration-test reports. Vendors may submit executive summaries, attestation letters, or similar documentation that identifies the assessment scope, date completed, assessor qualifications, and remediation status of any significant findings. The City reserves the right to request additional information during the evaluation process if necessary.

RFI 5: Are there any specific accessibility requirements, such as WCAG 2.1 AA compliance?

A5: Yes. The proposed solution should comply with applicable accessibility requirements, including the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 Level AA or higher. Vendors should identify their level of compliance and provide a current Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) or equivalent accessibility conformance documentation, if available.

RFI 6: Will the City require a dedicated sandbox/test environment after the official go-live?

A6: The City prefers the availability of a dedicated sandbox, test, or training environment to support configuration testing, training, future enhancements, and system validation activities. Vendors should describe available options, associated costs, and any limitations.

RFI 7: Please provide clarification on the reference requirements outlined in Section 5.2.2. Our firm specializes in delivering cutting-edge, innovation-led solutions, and we are proposing an Agentic AI-driven system designed to significantly modernize and streamline municipal operations. Given the advanced nature of our solution, would the City consider alternative references and supporting materials in lieu of three municipal recreation software references?

A7: The City strongly prefers references from organizations that have implemented and are actively using the proposed recreation registration and management solution in a production environment, particularly within local government, public sector, parks and recreation, or similar operational environments.

The City understands that emerging technologies and innovative solutions may have a limited number of directly comparable municipal recreation references. Vendors may submit additional references demonstrating successful implementation of complex software solutions, AI-enabled platforms, cloud-based systems, cybersecurity programs, or large-scale public-sector technology deployments. Vendors may also provide supporting documentation describing their technical approach, implementation methodology, system architecture, security framework, and integration capabilities.

However, the City reserves the right to place greater evaluation weight on references demonstrating successful operation of comparable recreation management, registration, facility reservation, membership management, and public-facing transactional systems.

RFI 8: The Terms and Conditions is not attached to the proposal. Can you send that a separate document for us to review?

A8: A sample Service Agreement is attached. (attachment A)

RFI 9: Please provide details of the current RecDesk configuration, enabled modules, customizations, and integrations.

A9: The City currently utilizes RecDesk for class and program registration, facility reservations, memberships, and point-of-sale transactions. The RFP includes current transaction volumes and operational information to assist proposers in understanding the City's usage environment.

At this time, the City has not prepared detailed documentation regarding the current RecDesk configuration, enabled modules, customizations, or integrations. Proposers should base their responses on the functional and technical requirements outlined in the RFP and Attachment 2.

The City does not intend to require vendors to replicate the existing RecDesk configuration and encourages proposers to recommend industry best practices and standard system configurations that meet the City's operational needs.

RFI 10: What specific data objects must be migrated (e.g., customers, memberships, transactions, reservations, documents, waivers)?

A10: The City has not established a prescriptive list of data objects that must be migrated. Proposers should include a recommended data migration approach based on industry best practices and the City's current operational use of RecDesk.

At a minimum, the City anticipates migrating core operational data, including:

- Customer/household account records and contact information
- Program registration history and active enrollments
- Facility reservation and rental records
- Membership records and status information
- Financial transaction history, payments, credits, and refunds
- Facility, program, and activity setup data
- Instructor and vendor records, as applicable

The City is interested in understanding each vendor's capabilities, recommended migration strategy, assumptions, limitations, and any data validation processes associated with the migration effort.

Proposers should clearly identify which data elements they propose to migrate and any data objects that may require additional review or conversion services.

RFI 11: How many City staff users require administrative access, and what specific roles are expected?

A11: The City has not established a fixed number of administrative users for proposal purposes. Proposers should provide information regarding user licensing models, security role management, and scalability to accommodate future growth.

The City anticipates requiring administrative access for a variety of user roles, which may include:

- System Administrator
- Department Director
- Recreation Managers and Supervisors
- Recreation Coordinators
- Recreation Leaders
- Front Counter/Customer Service Staff
- Facility Reservation Staff
- Finance and Accounting Staff
- Instructors and Contract Service Providers (limited access, as applicable)
- Volunteers (limited access, as applicable, POS)

The proposed solution should support role-based security with configurable permissions that allow the City to assign access based on job responsibilities and business needs.

RFI 12: Are there any custom reports currently in use that must be replicated in the new system?

A12: The City is seeking a solution that provides robust standard reporting capabilities as well as flexible ad hoc reporting tools that allow staff to create, modify, and export reports as operational needs evolve.

The City currently utilizes a variety of operational, financial, registration, facility reservation, membership, and point-of-sale reports. Proposers should describe the standard reports available

within their system, the ability for staff to create custom reports without vendor assistance, and any report-writing tools included with the solution.

RFI 13: Please provide details of the required integration with Tyler New World ERP, including preferred interfaces, frequency, and data flows.

A13: The City currently utilizes Tyler Technologies' New World ERP system for financial management functions. The City anticipates integration between the proposed Parks and Recreation Management System and New World ERP to support the efficient exchange of financial and related operational data. The City anticipates that financial transaction data will be transferred at least weekly, although vendors may propose alternative schedules that support operational and accounting requirements.

At a minimum, the City expects the integration to support:

- General Ledger revenue postings
- Receipt and payment transaction exports
- Account code mapping and reconciliation
- Financial reporting and audit support
- Customer and transaction data necessary to support financial processing

RFI 14: Should payment processing be vendor-provided, or can third-party gateways be proposed?

A14: The City will consider both vendor-provided payment processing solutions and third-party payment gateway integrations. Vendors should describe their proposed approach, supported processors, integration methods, security compliance, and associated costs.

RFI 15: Please clarify expected POS hardware compatibility requirements (e.g., receipt printers, scanners, cash drawers, kiosks).

A15: The system must support industry-standard POS peripherals without reliance on proprietary or vendor-locked hardware, including the following:

Receipt Printers

The solution must be compatible with standard thermal receipt printers commonly used in municipal and recreation environments, including Epson TM-series and Star Micronics devices. Supported connection methods should include USB and Ethernet, with Wi-Fi preferred for mobile or event-based deployments. Printing should function through standard Windows drivers or browser-based printing without requiring proprietary middleware.

Barcode / QR Code Scanners

The system must support USB HID (keyboard-wedge) barcode scanners as a minimum requirement. Support for 2D imaging scanners capable of reading QR codes is required to accommodate digital passes, memberships, and mobile check-ins. Bluetooth wireless scanners are preferred for offsite or mobile programming.

Cash Drawers

Cash drawers must integrate through standard POS receipt printer kick ports (RJ11/RJ12) or USB-

connected configurations. The system must support automatic drawer opening triggered by completed cash transactions within the POS workflow.

Payment Terminals

If payment hardware is utilized, it must support integration with EMV-compliant card readers and terminals capable of chip, tap-to-pay (NFC), and magstripe transactions. Devices must integrate with common payment processors via API or semi-integrated configurations, avoiding manual card entry except where compliant fallback is required.

General Requirements

The POS environment must be hardware-agnostic, supporting plug-and-play functionality using standard drivers and USB HID devices. The solution should not require proprietary hardware ecosystems or locally installed legacy middleware unless explicitly approved. It must support scalable deployment across multiple facilities with consistent configuration and centralized management capability.

RFI 16: Is mobile access required only for customers, or also for field staff and instructors?

A16: Mobile access is expected to support both customers and staff. The system should be designed as a role-based, mobile-responsive platform, supporting different permission levels.

RFI 17: Please provide any expected future growth assumptions beyond the current transaction volumes.

A17: The City of Lathrop anticipates continued and sustained growth in transaction volumes beyond current levels, driven by ongoing residential development, population increases, and expansion of Parks and Recreation programming and facilities. Over the next 3–7 years, the City expects annual transaction volume growth in the range of approximately 5%–10% year-over-year.

RFI 18: What are the City's expectations regarding data retention periods and archival requirements?

A18: The system must support configurable, policy-based retention rules aligned with California public agency records retention practices (including California Records Retention Schedule guidance and City Clerk requirements). Records must be maintained for a minimum of 7 years or longer where legally required for operational and financial data, allow for long-term archival with retrievability and audit integrity, comply with California municipal records retention and CPRA obligations, and follow secure, exportable, and legally defensible data storage practices.

RFI 19: What level of onsite training is expected versus virtual training sessions?

A19: The City expects a hybrid training model consisting of comprehensive onsite, hands-on training during implementation and go-live, supplemented by ongoing virtual training sessions, recorded materials, and remote support. Onsite training is critical for core operational readiness, while virtual training is expected to support long-term onboarding, refresher instruction, and continuous system improvement across a diverse and rotating workforce.

RFI 20: Please provide any sample forms, waivers, permits, and registration workflows currently in use.

A20: A sample Release of Liability Waiver is attached. (attachment B) The City currently uses a combination of structured digital and staff-assisted workflows for program registration, waivers, facility permits, and recreation operations. These include youth and adult program registration forms, liability waivers with electronic signatures, facility rental, special event permits, code of conduct signatures, concussion protocol acknowledgment forms, summer camp extended registration forms, and supporting administrative forms. The selected system must fully support and modernize these workflows through configurable, end-to-end digital processes that ensure compliance, auditability, and ease of use for both staff and the public.

RFI 21: Please confirm whether implementation partners or subcontractors are acceptable for integration or migration services.

A21: The City of Lathrop permits the use of implementation partners and subcontractors for integration and data migration services; however, the primary vendor shall remain fully responsible for all project deliverables. All subcontractors must be disclosed in advance, demonstrate relevant public-sector experience, comply with applicable data security and regulatory requirements, and are subject to City approval.

RFI 22: The RFP requests a single-vendor solution but notes the City will consider a prime vendor subcontracting with a third-party for a specific function. Are there any modules where the City already has a preference for or an existing relationship with a third-party provider (e.g., league scheduling, access control)?

A22: The City of Lathrop's intent is to implement a single-vendor Parks and Recreation management platform with all core functionality delivered natively. The only required third-party integration is with the City's existing Tyler Technologies New World ERP financial system. No additional league management, access control, or registration platforms are mandated at this time; however, the City may consider limited third-party integrations where a clear operational need exists and where functionality is not fully supported within the proposed core system.

RFI 23: The RFP lists "senior programs including trips" as a required capability. Can the City provide more detail on what trip management entails, for example, does this include transportation booking, waitlist management, participant payment collection, or trip permission forms?

A23: Senior trip management is expected to be a fully integrated component of the recreation platform, including participant registration, capacity-controlled enrollment, waitlist automation, payment processing, and trip-specific digital permission and liability forms. While the City does not require a standalone transportation booking module, the system must support documentation and coordination of transportation logistics, including participant manifests and vendor coordination where applicable.

RFI 24: The RFP shows 22,501 active account records. What data does the City expect to migrate to the new system?

A24: The City expects migration of all active and inactive customer account data (approximately 22,501 active records), along with complete associated historical records including program registrations, financial transactions, facility reservations, waivers, permits, and configuration data. Migration must preserve full relational integrity across all datasets to ensure continuity of operations, financial reconciliation, audit compliance, and historical reporting. All data necessary to support

ongoing customer service, reporting, and legal/audit requirements must be included in the migration scope.

RFI 25: Are the 147 membership types listed in the RFP all actively in use, or is the City looking to consolidate/rationalize membership offerings as part of the migration?

A25: The City's current 147 membership types reflect historical configuration rather than active operational necessity, and many are not regularly used. As part of the migration, the City expects the vendor to support consolidation and rationalization of membership structures to reduce redundancy and improve operational efficiency. The goal is not to replicate the existing configuration, but to implement a streamlined, rules-based membership model that better aligns with current and future program delivery needs while preserving required historical and financial data.

RFI 26: What specific data elements does the City require to flow between the recreation management system and New World? For example: GL code-level revenue postings, accounts receivable, journal entries, cash receipts, deferred revenue, or end-of-day batch reconciliation files?

A26: The City expects the proposed solution to support integration with Tyler Technologies New World ERP for financial reconciliation and reporting purposes. At a minimum, vendors should describe their ability to support revenue postings, payment transactions, cash receipts, journal entries, account coding, and reconciliation processes. Vendors should identify available integration methods, supported data exchange formats, and any assumptions regarding implementation. The City will work with the selected vendor during implementation to finalize detailed integration requirements.

RFI 27: The RFP states a preference for solutions hosted on FedRAMP-authorized cloud infrastructure. Is FedRAMP Moderate authorization a mandatory requirement or an evaluated preference? Will a SOC 2 Type II report combined with independent security assessments substantially equivalent to FedRAMP Moderate be sufficient?

A27: FedRAMP authorization is not a mandatory requirement. The City will evaluate FedRAMP authorization as an indicator of security maturity. Vendors that do not possess FedRAMP authorization may provide evidence of equivalent security controls, including SOC 2 Type II reports, ISO 27001 certification, independent security assessments, penetration testing results, and documented alignment with the NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) and NIST SP 800-53 security controls.

RFI 28: The RFP requests ISO 27001 certification. Will a current SOC 2 Type II report with the Security trust service criterion be considered as an equivalent or complementary attestation in lieu of an ISO 27001 certificate, given that both standards address overlapping information security controls?

A28: Yes. The City recognizes that SOC 2 Type II and ISO 27001 address many overlapping security control areas. Vendors that do not maintain ISO 27001 certification may provide SOC 2 Type II reports and other independent third-party security assessments demonstrating comparable information security governance, risk management, and operational security controls. The City reserves the right to evaluate the overall maturity of the vendor's security program based on the documentation provided.

RFI 29: Does the City require the vendor to submit documentation for all items listed in Section 3.1.8 at the time of proposal, or will certain documents (e.g., penetration test executive summary, incident response plan) be acceptable as part of a post-award due diligence process?

A29: Vendors should provide as much of the requested documentation as possible with their proposal. Where certain documents are considered confidential or are not appropriate for public procurement submissions, executive summaries, attestations, certifications, or equivalent documentation may be provided. The City reserves the right to request additional documentation during the evaluation process, demonstrations, interviews, negotiations, or post-award due diligence activities.

RFI 30: Regarding league scheduling: Is the City currently managing leagues in-house, or does it rely on a third-party league management platform? What sports or league types are in scope (e.g., adult softball, youth soccer, pickleball)?

A30: The City of Lathrop currently utilizes TeamSideline as a supporting third-party platform for league scheduling, scoring, and standings management, while core recreation operations remain managed in-house. The City's intent is for the selected system to provide comprehensive, native league management functionality that can fully replace or significantly reduce reliance on external tools. The system must support end-to-end league workflows, including registration, scheduling, scoring, standings, and communications, while also providing transition support capabilities for any phased migration away from TeamSideline.

RFI 31: The RFP mentions a 3-year contract with one extendible term. Can the City confirm: (a) the base contract term is 3 years, and (b) the optional renewal term duration? Is the renewal term for 1, 2, or 3 additional years?

A31: The base contract term is three (3) years, with one optional renewal term. The City's anticipated renewal structure is a single two (2) year extension, subject to mutual agreement, satisfactory vendor performance, and budget approval. Renewal is not automatic and will be evaluated based on system performance, service quality, and evolving operational needs.

RFI 32: Regarding credit card processing (Section 5.8.2): Does the City have an existing merchant account or payment processor preference, or is the City open to the selected vendor's integrated payment processing solution?

A32: While the City is open to evaluating both vendor-provided integrated payment processing solutions and integrations with existing merchant processing services, the selected solution must be PCI-compliant, support modern payment methods, integrate seamlessly with registration and POS workflows, and provide accurate reconciliation with the City's financial system, including Tyler New World ERP. The City reserves the right to select the most cost-effective and operationally efficient payment processing model during implementation.

RFI 33: The RFP notes that short-listed vendors may be required to complete a 2-day Proof of Concept demonstration. Can the City share in advance the functional areas or specific scenarios that will be prioritized during the POC, so vendors can prepare relevant configurations and data?

A33: The City's 2-day Proof of Concept will be scenario-based and focused on validating end-to-end Parks and Recreation workflows. Priority areas include customer registration and POS

transactions, league management (including scheduling and scoring), facility reservations and permitting, waiver and form processing, senior trip management, communications, and reporting. Vendors should be prepared to demonstrate these workflows using realistic municipal recreation data and high-volume operational scenarios representative of the City's current and anticipated future needs.

RFI 34: Will the POC be conducted in-person at City offices in Lathrop, CA, or will virtual/remote demonstrations be considered?

A34: The City of Lathrop anticipates that the Proof of Concept (POC) will be conducted in person at City facilities in Lathrop, CA, as this format best supports hands-on evaluation of system workflows, usability, and performance in a realistic operational environment. While virtual participation may be considered, in-person delivery is the City's preferred format for the POC process.

RFI 35: The RFP requires disclosure of AI, ML, and automated decision-making features (Section 3.1.7). Does the City have specific restrictions on the use of AI-powered features within the platform, or is the intent of this section primarily to ensure full transparency and data protection controls?

A35: The primary intent of Section 3.1.7 is to ensure transparency, data protection, security, privacy, and governance regarding the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML), Generative AI, and automated decision-making technologies. Vendors should clearly disclose any AI-enabled functionality, data usage practices, model training practices, third-party AI services, and available controls. The City reserves the right to evaluate AI-related functionality, risks, governance controls, and compliance with applicable privacy and security requirements as part of the proposal evaluation process.

RFI 36: We are Canadian firm, with data backup centers in the US. Is the Hosting environment a hard requirement for this RFP?

A36: Yes. Pursuant to Section 3.1.6 of the RFP, the proposed solution must be hosted within the United States, and all City data, backups, disaster recovery data, and associated processing environments must remain within the United States unless otherwise approved in writing by the City.

Vendors should clearly identify the locations of all production, backup, disaster recovery, and data processing environments as part of their proposal.

The City restricts network traffic from outside the United States. Therefore, solutions hosted outside the United States will create access, security, and operational issues and may not meet the City's technical requirements.

End of Addendum #1

.....
* Proposer Acknowledgment of Addendum #1:

Company Name

Date

Name & Title

Signature