



ADDENDUM NO. 1

Request for Proposals (RFP) Multi-Channel Communications & Outreach Platform Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District (GLACVCD)

Issued: April 23, 2026

This Addendum forms part of the above-referenced RFP and is intended to clarify questions received from prospective vendors.

The responses provided herein are intended to clarify the District's expectations and do not materially modify the scope of work or requirements set forth in the original RFP. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Vendors are responsible for acknowledging receipt of this Addendum in their proposal submission.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Q1: Is the District seeking a fully hosted SaaS solution, or would an on-premise/hybrid deployment also be acceptable?

A: The District's preference is for a fully hosted SaaS solution. Alternative deployment models (e.g., hybrid) may be considered if the vendor demonstrates that the solution meets all functional requirements, scalability expectations, security standards, and does not introduce additional administrative or infrastructure burden to the District.

Q2: Should vendors include printing and mailing services in their proposals, or only integration with third-party mailing providers?

A: Vendors should include their approach to direct mail, including integration with third-party mailing providers. The District's primary expectation is seamless, address-based outreach as part of a unified multi-channel solution. Optional in-house printing and mailing services may be included but must be clearly identified and separately priced.

Q3: Could you clarify the volume and type of existing data that will need to be migrated?

A: The District maintains a combination of subscriber/contact data, GIS-based service boundaries, and opt-out/consent records. The District is not prescribing exact data volumes or formats at this time. Vendors should describe their data migration approach, including assumptions, risks, dependencies, and estimated level of effort.

Q4: Are there specific delivery speed benchmarks required for large-scale alerts?

A: The District has not established a specific minimum benchmark. Vendors should describe system delivery capacity, throughput by channel, any limitations, and expected performance during large-scale or emergency communications.

Q5: Should proposals include community survey design and execution, or only messaging/education strategy?

A: The District's primary focus is on messaging, public education, and strategic communications. Community survey services are not required but may be included as optional services and must be clearly identified and separately priced.

Q6: Beyond TCPA, CAN-SPAM, CCPA, and CPRA, are there additional requirements vendors must address?

A: Vendors should ensure their solution supports compliance with applicable California public agency requirements, including public records and records retention obligations. The platform should support retention, search, retrieval, and export of communications records, along with appropriate audit trails.

Q7: Is there a target budget range for implementation and annual support?

A: The District has not established a target budget range. Vendors should propose pricing based on their standard models and provide a clear, itemized cost structure for implementation, ongoing support, and any optional services.

Q8: Will oral presentations/interviews be required?

A: The District may, but is not required to, conduct oral presentations or interviews and may make a selection based solely on written proposals. Vendors should ensure their proposals are complete and fully responsive.

Q9: May vendors submit a video as part of their proposal?

A: Vendors may submit a non-mandatory video as supplemental information. Videos will not replace the written proposal and should add value by demonstrating relevant functionality, use cases, or implementation approach.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1