



RFP FOR RECREATION MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE

Addendum No. 1: July 15, 2026

This Addendum No. 1 to the subject Request For Proposals (RFP) provides answers to questions. All provisions of and attachments to this Addendum No. 1 are hereby incorporated by reference into the subject RFP. Proposers shall account for all provisions pursuant to this Addendum No. 1 in submitting their proposals.

Questions and Answers

Question 1.1: Minimum Requirement #2 states the vendor must have been in business for over 10 years in the recreation software industry. We respectfully ask whether the District would accept demonstrated equivalent experience in satisfaction of this requirement, such as municipal client references, platform transaction history, or revenue volume.

Answer 1.1: All minimum requirements are to remain required for this RFP.

Question 1.2: Section VI Price Form page states "To be submitted in a sealed envelope separate from proposal documents and marked "Price Form". As this proposal is to be emailed to you, will it be okay to have the price form as a separate attachment?"

Answer 1.2: Yes, please send the price form as a separate attachment to be emailed with your proposal.

Question 1.3: Can you estimate the maximum number of staff who would access the system simultaneously.

Answer 1.3: The District estimates around 40 staff would use the system at any given time.

Question 1.4: What are the primary challenges prompting the replacement?

Answer 1.4: The District's current system is not cloud based requiring the move to a cloud based solution.

Question 1.5: Are there any existing third-party systems that the selected solution must integrate with?

Answer 1.5: The District requires that the solution integrate with New World ERP (Tyler Solutions).

Question 1.6: The RFP states the payment processor must be proprietary and native to the platform - does this mean if the software vendor doesn't own their own payment processor they will be disqualified?

Answer 1.6: The solution having its own payment processor is highly desirable, but not required.

Question 1.7: Are there any PCI compliance or treasury requirements beyond those outlined in the RFP?

Answer 1.7: There are no requirements beyond what is outlined in the RFP.

Question 1.8: What is the desired go live date?

Answer 1.8: The District will wish to go live in early 2027.

Question 1.9: Are there any reporting requirements specific to California special districts or board reporting?

Answer 1.9: Standard recreation management software reporting is expected.

Question 1.10: Would the District consider additional value from a native branded mobile app in addition to a responsive design?

Answer 1.10: Mobile applications are not required for the software but may be desirable based on ease of use.

Question 1.11: Does the District prefer remote or on-site training? Or a combination of both.

Answer 1.11: A combination of both remote and on-site training will be preferable.

Question 1.12: Is 24/7 technical support expected?

Answer 1.12: Technical support is expected during normal business hours.

Question 1.13: Would the District prefer a fixed subscription or based on modules and licenses?

Answer 1.13: The District is open to either options.

Question 1.14: What is the total revenue generated by the District in these categories: Activity Registration, Facility Rentals/Permitting, and Memberships?

Answer 1.14: For Activity Registrations approximately \$1.5 Million. For Facility Rentals/Permitting approximately \$1 Million. For Memberships approximately \$5,000.

Question 1.15: What is the current credit card processing volume? Total number of transactions and average transaction amount.

Answer 1.15: For FY2025/2026, The District had 16,747 credit card transactions with an average transaction amount of \$158.

Question 1.16: Could the District confirm the expected number of internal users who will require access to the system, including administrators, front-desk staff, finance users, program staff, facility staff, and any other user types?

Answer 1.16: The District would require an estimated 100 internal users.

Question 1.17: If this information can be made public, what is the current and future budget allocated for this service? Alternatively, does the District have any cost expectations or a pricing threshold vendors are expected to stay within?

Answer 1.17: The District does not have a current or future budget allocated for this service.

Question 1.18: Is there an incumbent vendor currently providing the recreation management software or related services? If so, could the District share the reason for issuing this new RFP, such as contract expiration, performance concerns, feature gaps, pricing, or other considerations?

Answer 1.18: The current system is not cloud based and the District wishes to move to a cloud based solution.

Question 1.19: What was the most recent contract value and contract term for the current or most recent recreation management software contract?

Answer 1.19: The District owns the modules for the current solution, however, it is not cloud based.

Question 1.20: Could the District confirm the expected initial contract term and whether there will be any renewal options?

Answer 1.20: The District is open to other options, but primarily, the District goes with 3 year contracts with 2 – 1 year extensions.

Question 1.21: The RFP states that proposals shall be submitted via email, but the Fee Proposal / Price Form section refers to submitting the Price Form in a sealed envelope. Could the District confirm whether the Price Form should also be submitted electronically via email together with the proposal?

Answer 1.21: Please send the price form as a separate attachment to be emailed with your proposal.

Question 1.22: Could the District list the existing District systems and third-party technologies that the proposed solution is expected to integrate with, including but not limited to financial systems, website platforms, payment-related systems, and any other relevant internal systems?

Answer 1.22: The District currently owns modules from RecTrac which works with CardConnect as well. The selected solution must integrate with New World ERP (Tyler Technologies).

Question 1.23: Could the District provide more detail on the expected league management use cases?

Answer 1.23: The District currently utilizes Team Sideline for league management. However, the District would like a solution with an option for league management for future cases.

Question 1.24: Could the District clarify the expected permit or contract generation requirements for facility reservations, including whether standard templates, e-signature, approval workflows, document storage, and automated customer delivery are required?

Answer 1.24: Yes – Standard templates, E-signatures, approval workflows, document storage, and automated customer delivery will all be required.

Question 1.25: Could the District clarify the expected POS requirements, including whether merchandise sales are required, what types of merchandise are expected, whether inventory tracking is required, and what POS hardware must be supported?

Answer 1.25: The District will require the solution to include POS capabilities for each facility where in person registration takes place. Merchandise sales are not required. These POS systems are specifically for registration purposes.

Question 1.26: Could the District clarify the requirements related to waivers and account balances, including whether waivers must support electronic signature, version control, minor/guardian approval, and whether customers must be able to view and pay outstanding balances online?

Answer 1.26: Yes, each of these are requirements for the solution.

Question 1.27: Could the District clarify the requirement for a fully integrated proprietary payment processor, especially whether the District requires the vendor to provide and support its own native payment processing solution directly, or whether payment processing partnerships/acquiring relationships are acceptable as long as the payment experience is fully integrated into the platform?

Answer 1.27: The solution having its own payment processor is highly desirable, but not required.

Question 1.28: Are there any preferred data center location, data residency, security certification, or compliance requirements vendors should consider when preparing their proposal?

Answer 1.28: The District's IT Department requires that all data be stored within the United States only.

Question 1.29: Will the District publish responses to vendor questions in the form of an official addendum or consolidated Q&A document available to all vendors?

Answer 1.29: All answers will be given via Addendum No. 1 and emailed to all vendors who submitted questions.

Question 1.30: The RFP states the payment processor must be “native to the platform” and may not rely on “third-party gateway providers or external payment processing systems for transaction authorization, settlement, or reconciliation.” Is the intent to exclude architectures where the software vendor is the single point of accountability for all payment processing, support, and reconciliation with the vendor's own branded payment product embedded directly in the platform even if that product is built on a licensed payment processing/acquiring partner behind the scenes (a common architecture for embedded-payments platforms), or is the District specifically seeking to exclude vendors that require the District to separately contract with, configure, and manage an independent third-party gateway (e.g., a merchant account the District sets up directly with an outside processor)?

Answer 1.30: The solution having its own payment processor is highly desirable, but not required. This is to prevent the District from having to work with two separate software.

Question 1.31: Does the District have an existing merchant services relationship or bank account structure that the selected system must integrate with, or is the District open to processing through a new merchant account established under the selected vendor's payment solution?

Answer 1.31: The District is open to utilizing the new software payment solution.

Question 1.32: What financial/accounting or ERP system(s) does the District currently use (e.g., Tyler, Caselle)?

Answer 1.32: Tyler Technologies, New World ERP.

Question 1.33: What recreation management or registration system is the District currently using, and approximately how many active customer/household accounts, program records, and years of transaction history will need to be migrated?

Answer 1.33: The District currently utilizes RecTrac. No data will be migrated from RecTrac to the new system.

Question 1.34: Does the District anticipate a hard cutover to the new system, or a phased/parallel-run approach during the October 2026 implementation start?

Answer 1.34: The District would like a hard cutover to the new system in early 2027.

Question 1.35: Given that many recreation management platforms price using a combination of subscription and transaction-based fees tied to registration/payment volume, may vendors present a detailed fee schedule (subscription + per-transaction or percentage-based fees) supporting the “Total Annual Cost” figure, with the Price Form total reflecting a good-faith estimate based on stated or projected transaction volume?

Answer 1.35: Please provide all cost variations in the proposal along with an estimated total annual cost figure.

Question 1.36: If the District requires a true firm fixed annual price regardless of transaction volume, can the District share the current annual registration count, transaction volume, and/or program revenue so vendors can calculate an accurate fixed-price equivalent?

Answer 1.36: The District is open to different price structures.

Question 1.37: Section VI directs that the Price Form be “submitted in a sealed envelope separate from proposal documents,” while Section II.D.2 directs that the full proposal package be submitted by email. Since email submission does not allow for a physical sealed envelope, what mechanism does the District expect for maintaining Price Form confidentiality electronically (e.g., a separate, clearly labeled email, or a password-protected attachment with the password provided separately)?

Answer 1.37: Yes, please send the price form as a separate attachment to be emailed to me.

Question 1.38: Section V.A.1 specifies proposals should be “typed, double spaced, and single-sided” and not exceed 30 pages excluding Appendices. For an electronic PDF submission, is double-spacing a firm formatting requirement for the technical narrative, and does the 30-page limit include the Letter of Transmittal, or only the Technical Proposal narrative?

Answer 1.38: This limit is for the Technical Proposal narrative.

Question 1.39: Section V.B requires proof of “any and all licenses and/or certifications required by law... in performing under the scope... of this RFP.” For a cloud-based SaaS vendor, are there specific state or local business licenses the District expects submitted?

Answer 1.39: The solution is expected to follow all licenses and certifications required by law in the state of California.

Question 1.40: Section IV.A references graffiti abatement and public frontage/median landscaping services managed by the Department. Are these operational areas expected to be tracked or scheduled within the Recreation Management Software, or are they outside the scope of this procurement?

Answer 1.40: That would be outside the scope of this procurement.

Question 1.41: Approximately how many active membership/pass types are currently offered, and do any require recurring or installment-based billing?

Answer 1.41: The District does not currently have membership or passes offered. However, the District would like the capability to do so should it arise in the future.

Question 1.42: Regarding online/mobile access, is a native downloadable mobile app required, or is a mobile responsive web interface sufficient to satisfy this requirement?

Answer 1.42: A mobile app is not a requirement for this RFP.

Question 1.43: For the 2.5-acre special event venue, does the District require public ticket sales with capacity/seating management, or is event registration limited to headcount-style participant tracking?

Answer 1.43: Event registration is limited to headcount-style participant tracking.

Question 1.44: The tentative schedule shows Award of RFP in September 2026 and Implementation Begins October 2026, with no stated go-live date. Does the District have a target go-live date or fiscal-year constraint driving the implementation timeline?

Answer 1.44: The District would like to fully launch in early 2027.

Question 1.45: Approximately how many staff users will require training, and does the District have a preference for in-person, virtual, or train-the-trainer training delivery?

Answer 1.45: Approximately 50 users will require training while approximately 100 users will need accounts. The District would like a combination of in person, virtual, and train-the-trainer delivery.

Question 1.46: Since award may be made without vendor interviews or demonstrations, is there any opportunity for vendors to supplement their written proposal with a brief live walkthrough prior to the District's final scoring, or should the written proposal be considered the sole basis for evaluation absent an invitation to interview?

Answer 1.46: The written proposal shall be considered the sole basis for evaluation. Solutions that are asked to move on to round 2 will have the opportunity to give demos/interviews.

Question 1.47: What are the District's primary goals and operational challenges it hopes to address through this recreation management software project?

Answer 1.47: The District would like to provide a user-friendly experience to both internal and external users along with speed of registration.

Question 1.48: What financial or accounting system does the District currently use, and what level of integration or export functionality is required?

Answer 1.48: The District utilizes New World ERP (Tyler Technologies). Automatic revenue data integration is required.

Question 1.49: Please confirm whether the District expects the selected recreation management system to integrate with TeamSideline for league scheduling and management.

Answer 1.49: Integration is not required, but it highly favorable.

Question 1.50: Does the District currently use any other third-party systems or integrations that the selected vendor will be expected to support, such as GIS, lighting controls, or other systems?

Answer 1.50: Integration with Musco Sports Lighting scheduling is not required, but highly desirable.

Question 1.51: What data conversion is anticipated, including the approximate volume and types of data to be migrated, such as household accounts, activity history, memberships, facility reservations, financial history, waivers, and outstanding balances?

Answer 1.51: No data will be migrated from RecTrac to the new solution.

Question 1.52: The tentative schedule identifies implementation beginning in October 2026. Does the District have a target go live date, and are there any seasonal deadlines, contract expiration dates, or major registration periods that should be considered in the implementation plan?

Answer 1.52: The District would like to fully launch in early 2027.

Question 1.53: Approximately how many credit card payment terminals will be required for in-person transactions across the District's facilities and activities?

Answer 1.53: Approximately 13 credit card payment terminals would be required.

Question 1.54: Please identify the District's current payment provider and current processing rates. Does the District currently pass any credit card processing fees to customers, and if so, please describe the current policy and fee structure?

Answer 1.54: The District currently utilizes RecTrac with CardConnect. Fees are not currently passed on to customers, but this is something the District is open to in the future.

Question 1.55: Has the District participated in demonstrations of recreation management software products during the past 24 months or in connection with this project? If so, please identify the products demonstrated.

Answer 1.55: The District has not seen any demonstrations in connection with this specific RFP.

Question 1.56: Could the District please provide a breakdown of annual transactions by payment method (credit/debit card, ACH, cash/check) processed through the recreation management software solution during the most recently completed fiscal year?

Answer 1.56: For Fiscal Year 2025/2026, the District processed 13,993 credit/debt transactions, 7 ACH transactions, and 55 check transactions.

Question 1.57: On page 5 in "G. Acceptance of Order" the District is referencing Section VII for a Sample JCSD Standard Agreement. This agreement seems to be missing from the RFP document. Could you please supply the Standard Agreement?

Answer 1.57: In the case of this recreation software, the District will utilize the proposers agreement.

Question 1.58: Please let us know the annual revenue that the district processes broken down by: Annual Cash Amount, Annual Credit Card Amount, Annual ACH Amount.

Answer 1.58: For Fiscal Year 2025/2026, the District received approximately \$2.5 million in credit card and \$30,000 in ACH. The District does not accept cash.

Question 1.59: Please let us know how many total revenue transactions the district has annually broken down by: Annual Cash Transactions, Annual Credit Card Transactions, Annual ACH Transactions.

Answer 1.59: For Fiscal Year 2025/2026, the District processed 13,993 credit/debt transactions, 7 ACH transactions, and 55 check transactions. The District does not accept cash.

Question 1.60: Does the District require the proposed solution to meet specific digital accessibility standards (e.g., WCAG 2.1 AA, Section 508, or California accessibility requirements)? If so, should vendors include documentation such as a VPAT or accessibility conformance statement with their proposal?

Answer 1.60: This is a requirement as part of the ADA and will be required of the accepted software.

Question 1.61: Can the District identify its current recreation management software solution and describe the primary business objectives or challenges driving this procurement?

Answer 1.61: The District currently uses RecTrac as a non-cloud based version. The District would like to move forward with a cloud-based software in order to increase ease of use internally and externally.

Question 1.62: Does the district have a budget secured for the annual costs and implementation costs related to this project?

Answer 1.62: There is currently no budget for this project. The proposal selected will need to be brought to the board for budget allocation.

Question 1.63: If there is a budget secured for this project, is the district able to share those budgetary figures or let us know a 'cost not to exceed'?

Answer 1.63: There is currently no budget for this project. The proposal selected will need to be brought to the board for budget allocation.

Question 1.64: Can the district share information about the evaluation committee who will be conducting the review of RFP responses for this project - roles and titles of the committee, total number of committee members conducting the review, etc?

Answer 1.64: The selection committee will be made up of several members of the Parks & Recreation Department including the Director, Recreation Manager, Recreation Supervisors, and Management Analyst.

Question 1.65: Would a proposer's solution be considered compliant if all payment authorization, settlement, and reconciliation data is unified within the core software platform and fully managed by the vendor, even if the vendor's backend payment infrastructure is provided through a PCI Level 1 embedded payment processor, rather than owned outright by the vendor?

Answer 1.65: The solution having its own payment processor is highly desirable but not required.

Question 1.66: Should proposers price a fixed annual fee, a transaction/revenue-share model, or both for comparison?

Answer 1.66: Both price structures for comparison work best. The District is open to different pay structures.

Question 1.67: Regarding the Customer and Household Account Management requirements: should proposers describe their approach to resident account creation and onboarding — specifically, whether community members who already hold an account on the proposer's platform (for example, through another agency in the region) would be able to register with the District using that existing profile, rather than creating a new account? If so, will resident onboarding and ease of registration be considered in the evaluation of proposals?

Answer 1.67: With no data being migrated, the District expects all customers to create new accounts. Ease of use of the software will be a part of the evaluation.
