



CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

**DESIGN, SUPPLY, INSTALLATION, COMMISSIONING, AND SERVICE
OF A FULLY AUTOMATED VEHICLE STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM
(AVSRS) REPLACEMENT OR EXPANSION IMPROVEMENT**

ISSUE DATE: March 11, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A – RFP OVERVIEW, PROCUREMENT PROCESS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Section 1 – Introduction and General Information	6
1.1 Overview	
1.2 Purpose and Objectives	
1.3 Existing Conditions and Reference Information	
Section 2 – Procurement Schedule and Anticipated Process	7
2.1 RFP Schedule	
2.2 Submission Instructions	
2.3 Pre-Proposal Meeting, Site Visit, and Facility Walkthrough	
Section 3 – Proposal Process	9
3.1 Submittal- General	
3.2 Proposal Format Rules and Content Controls	
3.3 Communications, Question, and Addenda	
3.4 RFP Upload Requirements and Confidential Trade Secret	
3.5 City Review of Vendor’s “Similar” System	
Section 4 – Procurement Conditions and General Reservations	10
Administrative Only	
Section 5 – Confidentiality, Public Records, and Proposal Handling	10
Administrative Only	

PART B – SCOPE OF WORK

Section 6 – Design Phases, Technical Responsibilities, and Required Design Outcomes	12
6.1 Overall Design Responsibility and Technical Accountability	
6.2 RFP Submittals vs. Post-Award Design Services	
6.3 Design Phasing Framework and Proposer-Defined Schedule	
6.4 Interface Management and Multidisciplinary Coordination	
6.5 Design Quality Assurance, Quality Control, and Precautionary Checks	
6.6 Code Compliance and Permitting Strategy	
6.7 Concept Design Phase – Feasibility and Risk Identification	
6.8 Schematic Design Phase – System Definition and Interface Resolution	
6.9 Design Development Phase – Technical Closure	
6.10 Construction Documents Phase – Buildability Assurance	
6.11 Design Support During Construction and Installation	
6.12 City Review and Documentation Control	
6.13 Relationship to Subsequent Sections	
Section 7 – Fabrication, Construction, Installation, and System Integration	16
7.1 Purpose and Overall Execution Responsibilities	
7.2 Proposer-Defined Execution Plan and Realistic Schedule	
7.3 Submittals, Shop Drawings, and Field-Ready Documentation	
7.4 Fabrication Planning and Supply Chain Controls	
7.5 Factory Acceptance Planning and Pre-Shipment Verification	
7.6 Site Logistics, Staging, Access, and Temporary Works	
7.7 Demolition, Selective Removal, and Retrofit Coordination	
7.8 Installation Sequencing, Tolerance Management, and Alignment Controls	
7.9 Controls, Software, IT/Network Integration, and Version Control	
7.10 Safety Systems and Emergency Operations	
7.11 Readiness Checks and Phase Controls	

- 7.12 Documentation During Installation and Field Change Control
- 7.13 Training Preparation and Operational Readiness Integration
- 7.14 Coordination With Testing and Commissioning
- 7.15 Execution-Phase Deliverables
- Section 8 – Testing, Commissioning, Acceptance, and Close-Out21**
 - 8.1 Purpose and Acceptance Philosophy
 - 8.2 Commissioning Plan and Test Governance
 - 8.3 Pre-Commissioning Readiness Verification
 - 8.4 Component and Subsystem Testing
 - 8.5 Integrated Functional Testing
 - 8.6 Safety Validation and Hazard Condition Testing
 - 8.7 Abnormal and Failure-State Testing
 - 8.8 Vehicle Recovery Demonstrations
 - 8.9 Operational Simulations and Peak Demand Testing
 - 8.10 Reliability Demonstration Period
 - 8.11 Data Logging and Acceptance Documentation
 - 8.12 Training and Turnover as Acceptance Preconditions
 - 8.13 Construction Administration and Close-Out Walkthrough
 - 8.14 Acceptance Framework and Completion Criteria
 - 8.15 Warranty Readiness and Post-Acceptance Planning
 - 8.16 Commissioning Package Deliverables
- Section 9 – Operations, Maintenance, Reporting, and Owner Visibility27**
 - 9.1 Purpose and Lifecycle Intent
 - 9.2 Operations Support and System Oversight
 - 9.3 Preventive Maintenance Program
 - 9.4 Corrective Maintenance and Repair Practices
 - 9.5 Maintenance and Repair Logging
 - 9.6 Real-Time Owner Access to Records
 - 9.7 Reporting, Trend Analysis, and Lifecycle Visibility
 - 9.8 Spare Parts and Repair Readiness
 - 9.9 Software Maintenance and Configuration Control
 - 9.10 Coordination With City Staff and Operators
 - 9.11 Knowledge Transfer and Documentation Updates
 - 9.12 Relationship to Acceptance and Long-Term Operations
 - 9.13 System Openness, Transferability, and Continuity of Control
 - 9.14 Ownership Transfer and Continuity of Ownership

PART C – PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

- Section 10 – Proposal Format and Administrative Requirements 32**
 - 10.1 Proposal Organization and Required Structure
 - 10.2 Page Limits, Font, and Formatting
 - 10.3 Submission Method, Deadline, Delivery Requirements
 - 10.4 Proposal Validity Period
 - 10.5 Confidential and Trade Secret Information
- Section 11 – Proposer Qualifications and Experience 34**
 - 11.1 Firm Qualifications and Organizational Experience
 - 11.2 Comparable AVSRS Project Experience
 - 11.3 Key Personnel and Project Team
 - 11.4 Financial Capacity and Organizational Stability
 - 11.5 Subcontractors and Strategic Partners
- Section 12 – Technical and Management Approach 35**
 - 12.1 Proposed System Summary
 - 12.2 Retrofit vs. Demolition Strategy

12.3 Existing Structure vs. Proposed Integration	
12.4 Design and Construction Methodology	
12.5 Construction Staging, Site Logistics, and Installation Process	
12.6 Response Time	
12.7 Schedule and Key Assumptions	
12.8 Project Team	
12.9 Experience and References	
12.10 Site Visit -Vendor Product	
12.11 Required Forms and Certifications	
Section 13 –Maintenance and Support Proposal	38
13.1 Operations Support Model	
13.2 Preventative Maintenance Program Description	
13.3 Corrective Maintenance and Failure Response	
13.4 Spare Parts Strategy and Repair Readiness	
13.5 Maintenance Staffing and Technical Expertise	
13.6 Maintenance Logging, Documentation, and Owner Visibility	
13.7 Reporting and Performance Monitoring	
13.8 Software Support, Updates, and System Configuration Control	
13.9 Relationship to Pricing Form	
FORMS & INFORMATIONAL DOCUMENTS	
FORMS FOR SUBMITTAL – (on PlanetBid)	41
Breif Written Pricing Narrative	
Form 1- Proposer’s Questionnaire	
Form 2- Proposer’s Pricing	
Form 3- Proposer’s Parts Criticality Inventory	
WEHO AVSRS Scaled Architectural Plans	
APPENDIX A - Acronyms and Definitions	42

PART A

RFP Overview

Background & Administration

CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
AUTOMATED VEHICLE STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM (AVSRS)

PART A – RFP INFORMATION, BACKGROUND, AND ADMINISTRATION

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

The City of West Hollywood ("City") invites proposals from qualified firms ("Proposers") for the design, construction, installation, testing, commissioning, and transition to operations of a fully automated vehicle storage and retrieval system (AVSRS) to serve the public. The base project scope anticipates delivery of a minimum of approximately 200 fully automated parking spaces within the City's existing parking facility/area. The scope of this RFP includes all work necessary to deliver a complete, functional, and publicly operable system, including design services, equipment procurement, construction and installation activities, systems integration, testing and commissioning, documentation, training, and transition to ongoing operations and maintenance services.

The City recognizes that Proposers may present differing technical approaches to achieve the City's objectives. Acceptable approaches may include retrofit of the existing structure, partial demolition and reconstruction, or full replacement of the facility, provided that the Proposer clearly describes its proposed approach, underlying assumptions, interfaces, risks, benefits, and implications to cost, schedule, performance, operations, and long-term maintainability. Proposers are responsible for demonstrating that their proposed solution is technically feasible, operationally practical, and appropriate for long-term public use.

1.2 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to solicit comprehensive and comparable proposals from qualified firms capable of delivering a fully integrated Automated Vehicle Storage and Retrieval System (AVSRS). **Only firms that successfully completed the City's prior Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and were formally identified as prequalified are eligible to submit proposals in response to this RFP.** The City intends to evaluate and select a Proposer that can provide a technically sound, operationally reliable, and financially responsible solution supported by disciplined design, coordinated construction, and long-term performance.

This RFP is being issued to advance the City's evaluation and potential implementation of an AVSRS solution to improve current and long-term parking operations. The City expects Proposers to submit serious, fully developed responses consistent with the scope and requirements set forth herein. While the City reserves all rights available under applicable procurement laws—including the right to reject proposals or modify the solicitation—the City is undertaking this process with the intent of identifying the most qualified solution and qualified proposer.

Key Project Objectives

The City's objectives for this project include:

- Delivery of a safe, code-compliant, and operationally reliable automated parking system suitable for continuous public use.
- Efficient and predictable vehicle parking and retrieval performance that supports high-quality parker service.
- Clearly defined system behavior under both normal and abnormal operating conditions, including fault response and recovery.

- Realistic, coordinated design and construction sequencing that minimizes risk and avoids rework.
- Transparent and disciplined operations and maintenance practices that support long-term durability and maintainability.
- Clear communication and structured reporting throughout the lifecycle of the system.
- Real-time City access to operational dashboards, maintenance logs, and performance reporting data.

Proposals shall clearly demonstrate alignment with these objectives and provide sufficient detail to allow a meaningful technical and lifecycle evaluation.

1.3 Existing Conditions and Reference Information

The City currently owns and operates an automated parking facility located in West Hollywood, California. Reference information regarding existing conditions may be provided to assist Proposers in developing their proposals. Such information is provided for general reference only and is not intended to represent a complete or guaranteed depiction of existing conditions. Proposers are responsible for verifying site conditions, identifying interfaces with existing structural, mechanical, electrical, fire/life safety, information technology, and operational systems, and incorporating those findings into their proposed approach.

The City expects Proposers to demonstrate familiarity with the challenges and requirements of public-facing automated parking systems, including peak demand operations, user safety, vehicle recovery, abnormal operating conditions, and continuity of service.

For purposes of this Request for Proposals, the term “**City**” shall mean the City of West Hollywood and may include City staff, the City’s authorized representatives, consultants, advisors, inspectors, or other agents acting on the City’s behalf within the scope of this procurement or any resulting agreement.

Current Parking Condition

The fully automated system is used by the City hall employees and the public, mostly who are attending the city hall. Employee parkers typically arrive between 7:30 am to 9:00 am and depart between 4:00 pm – 5:30 pm; and about 10%-25% for public parkers arriving and departing throughout the day.

SECTION 2 – PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE AND KEY DATES

The City intends to conduct this procurement in accordance with the schedule presented below. The City reserves the right to modify the schedule. Proposers are responsible for monitoring addenda and ensuring that all deadlines are met. Any revised dates issued by addendum shall supersede prior dates.

2.1 RFP Schedule

The following schedule reflects the City’s current planning assumptions, including an anticipated issuance date of **March 11, 2026**. Dates shown are subject to change by addendum. The City may adjust the schedule to support additional evaluation steps, facilitate clarification, or align with internal approval processes.

The City anticipates conducting the procurement generally in accordance with the schedule below. All dates are subject to change by email or written addendum. The City reserves the right to modify the schedule, conduct additional evaluation steps, or cancel the procurement at any time.

Issuance of this RFP does not constitute a commitment by the City to award a contract, select a particular technical solution, or reimburse any costs incurred in preparation of a proposal.

RFP SCHEDULE & TIMELINE

	Item	Due Date	Time (PST)
1	Distribution of bid document.	March 11	
2A	MANDATORY MEETING & WALKTHROUGH 1085 N. Sweetzer Ave., West Hollywood, CA AVSRS walkthrough for invited vendors only.	March 25 Waiver on-site	2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
2B	<i>Optional: On your own time, if preferred</i> External AM Peak traffic arrival observation External PM Peak traffic retrieval observation	On any day	7:30 am - 8:30 am 4:30 pm - 5:30 pm
4	Deadline to submit Questions #1	March 27	2:00 pm
5	City Responses to Questions #1	April 3	
6	PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DUE DATE	May 28	1:00 pm
7	City rep project visit of vendor relevant project. <i>City will determine which sites will be visited and notify vendor to coordinate.</i>	June-July	This date may change as needed.
8	Qualification & Relevant Project Evaluations		
9	Vendor Notification for Interview	TBD	
10	Virtual Interview Dates	TBD	

2.2 Submittal Instructions

Proposals and questions shall be submitted electronically through the City’s online bid portal: <https://www.weho.org/city-government/city-departments/public-works/bids>

Late submissions will not be accepted.

You may submit questions to the CITY about the RFP no later than the date stated in the schedule above, via the City’s online bid portal at:

<https://www.weho.org/city-government/city-departments/public-works/bids>

RFP Questions should be submitted in the City’s bid portal, PlanetBids as stated in Section 2.1. PlanetBids only allows for one (1) file to be uploaded. Therefore, all documents, excel files, and PDFs, etc. are to be compressed into one (1) zipped file before it can be properly uploaded.

DOWNLOAD FROM PLANETBIDS:

1. **RFP Document**
2. **Form 1 (Excel Form) - Proposers Questionnaire and Checklist**
3. **Form 2 (Excel Form) - Proposers Pricing**
4. **Form 3 (Excel Form) - Proposers Parts Criticality**
5. **AVSRS Architectural Design Drawings PDF**

UPLOAD SUBMITTAL ONTO PLANETBIDS:

Proposers must consolidate proposal and all required documents (including all Excel with its associated PDF files, proposal, certifications or any other items) into **one (1) ZIP file** before submitting proposal package onto PlanetBids, **which only allows one (1) file for submittal.**

2.3 – Pre-Proposal Meeting, Site Visit, and Facility Walkthrough

The City shall conduct a **mandatory pre-proposal walkthrough** meeting to provide a project overview, highlight key requirements, and respond to administrative questions.

Proposers are required to attend, as the project involves physical, logistical, and interface constraints that may affect technical approach and construction staging. The City will provide

instructions and waiver related to the AVSRS walkthrough, safety requirements, and any restrictions at location prior to walkthrough. Proposers shall be responsible for their own personnel's safety and compliance with all site rules during any visit.

Statements made verbally at any meeting or walkthrough are informational. Only written addenda issued by the City shall modify the RFP requirements or become part of the procurement record. Proposers shall not rely on any oral statements, site observations, or informal communications as the basis for their proposals.

SECTION 3 – PROPOSAL PROCESS

3.1 – Submittal - General

As detailed in Part C, proposals shall be submitted electronically in PDF format, except the raw Excel files, which shall be submitted along with their PDF copies, in accordance with the City's submittal instructions and by the deadline stated in the RFP schedule or any subsequent addendum. Late submissions may be deemed non-responsive. Proposers are responsible for confirming that their submission is complete, readable, and successfully transmitted.

Proposers shall submit the Excel forms without altering structure, hidden sheets, or embedded formulas, unless the City expressly authorizes changes by addendum. If a Proposer believes an RFP-provided form contains an error, the Proposer shall raise the issue through the formal Q&A process rather than modifying the form unilaterally.

3.2 – Proposal Format Rules and Content Controls

To promote fair evaluation and comparability across submissions, proposals shall comply with the format and content rules set forth in Part C. The City's intent is that proposals be evaluated on substantive technical content rather than marketing presentation.

Proposers shall not include marketing brochures, unrelated corporate collateral, or promotional material unrelated to the project. If such materials are included, the City may elect not to review them. Proposers shall provide complete and concise narratives that directly answer the RFP requirements; proposals that rely primarily on links to external websites (unless requested) or generic product cut sheets without project-specific explanation may be considered incomplete or non-responsive.

3.3 – Communications, Questions, and Addenda

All communications regarding this RFP shall be through the City's designated bid portal on PlanetBids. Proposers shall not contact City staff, elected officials, or other City representatives regarding this procurement except as permitted through the City's designated procurement contact. Proposers' communications shall be professional, project-focused, and limited to procurement-related matters. Communication on PlanetBids are public.

Proposers shall submit questions and requests for clarification in writing by the deadline identified in the schedule. Questions shall be submitted in a clear format that references the RFP section number and describes the requested clarification in complete sentences. The City may respond to questions by issuing written addenda. Addenda shall be considered part of the RFP package, and Proposers are responsible for reviewing and acknowledging all addenda in their proposal. No oral statement, email, or informal clarification shall modify the RFP unless it is incorporated into a formal addendum.

3.4 – RFP Upload Requirements and Confidentialor Trade Mark Submittals

RFP Questions should be submitted in the City's bid portal, PlanetBids as stated in Section 2.1. **PlantBids only allows for one (1) file to be uploaded. Therefore, all documents, excel files, and PDFs, etc. are to be compressed into one (1) zipped file before it can be properly uploaded.**

Trademark or Confidential Documents- Submit as a separate file as part of and within the one (1) zipped package. Note that marking every page of your proposal as “Confidential” does not mean the proposal is not subject to the California Public Records Act.

For other general questions, the RFP contact is: Lia Reyes at LVR@LVRintl.com; 888-471-4777, ext. 700.

3.5 City Review of Vendor’s “Similar” System

After the proposal submittals, the City may elect to conduct site visits to comparable operating systems, host interviews, request demonstrations, or perform other forms of technical validation following proposal submission. If the City elects to conduct some or all vendor’s AVSRS active system visits, the City anticipates a dedicated review window through approximately 1 to 2 month period, depending on the quantity of visits. Proposers shall cooperate in good faith with reasonable requests for technical clarification or system observation during this period, including identification of suitable comparable systems and coordination with system owners where the Proposer is able to facilitate access.

The City’s decision to conduct or not conduct such activities shall not be interpreted as an endorsement of any Proposer or a waiver of any RFP requirement.

SECTION 4- PROCUREMENT CONDITIONS AND GENERAL RESERVATIONS (Administrative Only)

The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, waive immaterial irregularities, and request additional information or clarification for purposes of evaluation. The City may elect to establish a shortlist, conduct interviews, request technical demonstrations, request best-and-final offers, and/or perform other evaluation steps described in this RFP. The City may also elect to negotiate scope refinements, sequencing approaches, and other project delivery considerations with one or more Proposers as part of the evaluation process, consistent with the City’s objectives.

Issuance of this RFP does not obligate the City to award a contract, select a particular system approach, or reimburse any Proposer for costs incurred in preparing or submitting a proposal. The City may cancel this RFP, reissue a revised solicitation, or pause the procurement process as needed to serve the City’s interests.

In the event of any inconsistency between this RFP (including addenda) and a Proposer’s submission, the requirements of this RFP shall govern for purposes of proposal evaluation. Where a Proposer proposes an alternative approach or deviation, the Proposer shall clearly identify the deviation, describe impacts to scope, schedule, interfaces, operations, maintainability, and cost.

SECTION 5 – CONFIDENTIALITY, PUBLIC RECORDS, AND PROPOSAL HANDLING (Administrative Statement)

Proposers shall understand that proposals submitted to the City may be subject to applicable public records requirements. Proposers should clearly identify any information they consider proprietary or confidential, and shall provide such identification in a manner consistent with City instructions. The City makes no representation that such information will be exempt from disclosure, and Proposers shall submit proposals accordingly.

The City reserves the right to use submitted proposal information for evaluation, internal review, and procurement documentation purposes. Proposers are responsible for ensuring that any subcontractor, technology partner, or affiliate information included in a proposal may be shared with the City for evaluation purposes. The City reserves the right to not award a contract for this RFP.

PART B

Scope of Work

PART B – SCOPE OF WORK

SECTION 6 – DESIGN PHASES, TECHNICAL RESPONSIBILITIES, AND REQUIRED DESIGN OUTCOMES

6.1 Overall Design Responsibility and Technical Accountability

Following award of the contract, the selected Proposer shall be fully responsible for the complete, integrated design of a fully automated vehicle storage and retrieval system (“AVSRS”) suitable for continuous public operation in the City of West Hollywood. The design shall be technically rigorous, operationally reliable, maintainable over its intended service life, and responsive to the constraints of a dense urban environment. The Scope of Work described in this Part B represents the City’s baseline expectations for project delivery. Proposers shall assume that these requirements will form the basis of the City’s final contractual scope, subject to refinement during post-award negotiations.

The City expects the design process to be used as the primary mechanism for Identifying, evaluating, and resolving technical, operational, spatial, and interface-related risks **before** fabrication, construction, or installation activities commence. The design shall not rely on assumptions that remain unverified, nor shall it defer resolution of critical technical issues to later phases of the project.

6.2 Clarification Regarding RFP Submittals Versus Post-Award Design Services

The design phases, activities, and deliverables described in this Section define the **scope of services to be performed after award** of the contract. Proposers are **not required to submit project-specific design drawings, calculations, or formal design deliverables** as part of their RFP response.

As part of the RFP response, Proposers shall instead describe their **design methodology and technical approach**, including how they execute each design phase, how they manage coordination and risk, how long comparable phases generally require, and how their approach adapts depending on whether the proposed solution involves reuse of the existing structure, partial demolition and retrofit, or full demolition and replacement.

6.3 Design Phasing Framework and Proposer-Defined Schedule

The design shall be organized into a sequence of clearly defined phases that progressively advance the system from conceptual feasibility through final construction documentation. While the City does not prescribe fixed durations for each phase, Proposers shall propose a **project-specific design schedule** that is efficient yet realistic, reflecting the technical complexity of the proposed system and the degree of modification required to existing conditions. The proposed design schedule shall demonstrate that sufficient time is allocated to coordination, verification, and review activities to prevent downstream errors. Overly compressed schedules that rely on later-phase correction of unresolved design issues are not consistent with the City’s expectations for this project.

At a minimum, the design shall include the following phases: (Proposers shall provide City staff ability to properly review plans, drawings, and cost estimate associated with each phase before moving to the next phase:

- Concept Design
- Schematic Design
- Design Development
- Construction Documents
- Design Support During Construction and Installation

6.4 Interface Management and Multidisciplinary Coordination (Critical Requirement)

A defining expectation of this project is that **system interfaces are explicitly identified, documented, and resolved during design**. Interface coordination shall be treated as a primary design responsibility and a core indicator of design quality.

The Proposer shall manage and resolve interfaces across, at minimum, the following categories:

- **Structural interfaces**, including load paths, anchorage, foundations, seismic considerations, and integration with existing or new structural systems
- **Architectural interfaces**, including spatial envelopes, access points, clearances, finishes, and public-facing elements
- **Electrical interfaces**, including power demand validation, distribution, redundancy, grounding, emergency power, and system isolation
- **Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (MEP) interfaces**, including ventilation, heat dissipation, environmental conditions, equipment service clearances, electrical, panels, loads, pipes, drainage
- **Fire and life safety interfaces**, including detection, suppression, alarms, emergency access, firefighter operations, and coordination with applicable fire codes
- **Controls and automation interfaces**, including PLCs, sensors, actuators, safety interlocks, and fail-safe logic
- **Software and cybersecurity interfaces**, including system control software, data integrity, access controls, and protection against unauthorized access
- **IT and network interfaces**, including connectivity, data transmission, remote monitoring, and integration with City or third-party systems
- **Operations and maintenance interfaces**, including service access, component replacement paths, diagnostics, and long-term maintainability

Each design phase shall advance interface resolution to an appropriate level of completeness, such that no interface critical to system performance, safety, or constructability remains unresolved at the conclusion of Design Development.

Proposers must identify and describe all required interfaces and coordination responsibilities as part of their design approach. Proposers are responsible for internal coordination of their team and subcontractors.

Interface Responsibility and Assumption Transparency.

As part of its design approach, the Proposer shall clearly identify which party is responsible for providing, modifying, validating, or coordinating each interface element, including any assumptions regarding existing conditions, third-party systems, utilities, fire/life safety systems, IT/network infrastructure, and City-furnished components. Interface responsibilities shall be defined clearly enough to avoid scope ambiguity and to allow the City to evaluate whether coordination risk is being managed appropriately during design.

6.5 Design Quality Assurance, Quality Control, and Precautionary Checks

The Proposer shall implement a formal internal quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) program throughout all design phases. QA/QC shall be embedded within the design workflow and shall include independent review of drawings, specifications, calculations, and narratives by qualified personnel not directly responsible for their preparation.

QA/QC activities shall specifically verify that:

- Design documents are internally consistent and coordinated across all disciplines
- Interfaces identified in Section 6.4 are resolved to the level required for the current design phase

- Design assumptions are clearly documented, validated, and not contradictory
- Safety systems and abnormal operating conditions have been considered
- No unresolved design conflicts remain that could reasonably impact fabrication, installation, or operations

As part of design quality assurance, design narratives shall include reasonable recovery time assumptions for representative failure scenarios, including single-component failures, emergency shutdown conditions, and manual intervention events, for the purpose of demonstrating that the proposed recovery strategies are operationally practical and consistent with the overall system design. As a precautionary measure, the Proposer shall confirm at the conclusion of each design phase that the objectives of that phase have been met and that advancement will not introduce avoidable downstream risk. This confirmation protects both the design team and the City by ensuring that errors are identified early rather than during construction or operation.

Vehicle Recovery as a Design Criterion.

As part of design QA/QC, the Proposer shall verify that vehicle recovery strategies are inherent to the system design and do not require dismantling major system components, structural elements, or extensive disassembly under foreseeable failure scenarios. The design shall identify safe access points, isolation logic, and recovery workflows (including manual intervention where required) so that vehicle recovery can be executed in a controlled and repeatable manner without prolonged system shutdown.

Advancement beyond each design phase shall not rely on later revision of fundamental system architecture, routing logic, safety concepts, or recovery strategies to correct avoidable omissions or unresolved design issues identified during earlier phases.

6.6 Code Compliance and Permitting Strategy

The design shall comply with all applicable building, fire, life safety, accessibility, and other regulatory requirements governing automated parking systems. The Proposer shall be responsible for identifying applicable codes and standards and integrating compliance considerations into each design phase.

Proposers shall describe their general approach to permitting and coordination with authorities having jurisdiction, including how code interpretations unique to automated parking systems are addressed. Code compliance shall be considered a continuous design responsibility and shall not be deferred to later phases.

6.7 Concept Design Phase – Feasibility and Risk Identification

Purpose and Required Outcomes

The Concept Design Phase establishes the fundamental technical and operational approach for the AVSRS. By the conclusion of this phase, the design shall demonstrate that the proposed system is **feasible within the site constraints** and that major technical risks have been identified.

This phase shall answer, at a minimum:

- Whether the proposed system can physically fit within the available envelope
- Whether reuse, partial demolition, or full replacement is technically viable
- Whether the proposed operating model is realistic for public use

6.8 Schematic Design Phase – System Definition and Interface Resolution

Purpose and Required Outcomes

The Schematic Design Phase refines the approved concept into a coordinated system definition. By the conclusion of this phase, the design shall demonstrate that:

- Major system components are appropriately sized and located

- Primary interfaces are defined and coordinated
- The system can be developed further without material reconfiguration
- Eliminate ambiguity regarding system routing, access, and spatial relationships
- Unresolved conflicts that could affect constructability or safety shall not be carried forward until addressed

6.9 Design Development Phase – Technical Closure

Purpose and Required Outcomes

The Design Development Phase advances the system to a level of technical completeness suitable for final documentation and procurement planning. By the conclusion of this phase:

- All major equipment selections shall be finalized
- All critical interfaces shall be resolved
- Safety, degraded-mode operation, and recovery scenarios shall be addressed conceptually
- The Public-facing app (if applicable) shall be developed or programmed with client input
- Close technical decisions
- Reliance on construction-phase coordination to resolve design issues is not acceptable for core system elements.

Failure-State Definition and Degraded-Mode Validation.

During Design Development, the Proposer shall explicitly define how the AVSRS behaves under representative single-component failure conditions, including failure of a lift, shuttle/AGV, pallet transfer mechanism, sensor group, or control subsystem. The design shall identify degraded-mode operating logic, available fallback pathways, and the expected operational impact on throughput or availability. These behaviors shall be documented sufficiently to demonstrate that degraded operation is intentional, predictable, and does not rely on ad-hoc intervention during commissioning or live operations.

6.10 Construction Documents Phase – Buildability Assurance

Purpose and Required Outcomes

The Construction Documents Phase produces complete, coordinated documents suitable for fabrication, installation, and permitting. By the conclusion of this phase:

- Design intent shall be fully documented
- No unresolved technical decisions affecting fabrication or installation shall remain
- Documents shall be suitable for execution without material interpretation

6.11 Design Support During Construction and Installation

The Proposer shall provide ongoing design support during fabrication, installation, and commissioning. This support shall ensure that field conditions are addressed consistently with design intent and that system performance is not compromised.

6.12 City Review and Documentation Control

At each design phase, the Design group shall present the design update to the City who shall have the opportunity to review submitted materials and provide comments. The Proposer shall document comments, respond appropriately, and incorporate agreed-upon revisions. City review does not relieve the Proposer of responsibility for design completeness or accuracy.

6.13 Relationship to Subsequent Sections

Fabrication, construction, installation, testing, commissioning, and operations are addressed in subsequent sections of this RFP. Completion of the design phases described herein is a prerequisite to those activities.

SECTION 7 – FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION, INSTALLATION, AND SYSTEM INTEGRATION (POST-AWARD SCOPE)

7.1 Purpose and Overall Execution Responsibilities

Following award, the selected Proposer shall furnish all labor, supervision, equipment, materials, services, coordination, and technical support required to fabricate (as applicable), deliver, install, integrate, and place into successful operation a fully automated vehicle storage and retrieval system (“AVSRS”) consistent with the approved design and the Proposer’s accepted technical approach. This includes all work necessary to achieve a complete, safe, functional, and maintainable system suitable for public use in West Hollywood.

This Section is intended to prevent common implementation failures by requiring that fabrication, construction, installation, and integration are treated as a single coordinated execution program. The Proposer shall plan and perform work in a manner that avoids rework, prevents unsafe conditions, protects existing structures or adjacent facilities, and ensures system readiness for testing and commissioning without last-minute redesign or “field engineering” of core system functions.

7.2 Proposer-Defined Execution Plan and Realistic Schedule

The City does not prescribe a single construction or installation schedule because Proposers may propose different approaches, including retrofit within the existing structure, selective demolition and reconfiguration, or full demolition and replacement.

The Proposer shall propose a realistic and efficient execution schedule appropriate to its approach. The schedule shall identify major phases and logical dependencies, including (as applicable) demolition, enabling works, foundation/structural modifications, equipment fabrication, delivery logistics, installation sequencing, system integration, testing and commissioning, and training.

The proposed schedule shall not assume that unresolved design, interface, or permitting issues will be “worked out during construction.” Sequencing shall reflect the practical realities of working within constrained envelopes typical of automated parking facilities, including access limitations for cranes, forklifts, rigging, delivery vehicles, staging areas, and temporary supports.

Interface Responsibility and Assumption Transparency.

As part of its design approach, the Proposer shall clearly identify which party is responsible for providing, modifying, validating, or coordinating each interface element, including any assumptions regarding existing conditions, third-party systems, utilities, fire/life safety systems, IT/network infrastructure, and City-furnished components. Interface responsibilities shall be defined clearly enough to avoid scope ambiguity and to allow the City to evaluate whether coordination risk is being managed appropriately during design.

Staging and Access Feasibility.

The Proposer’s execution plan shall include a narrative confirming how major components will physically be delivered, staged, rigged, and installed given the site’s constraints, including identification of (as applicable) crane locations and swing paths, delivery vehicle access routes and turning constraints, laydown or temporary storage areas, hoisting points, temporary openings or removals required for insertion of large components, and any required street occupancy or traffic control needs. Where the approach relies on limited work windows, phased closures, or off-hours deliveries, the Proposer shall describe how those constraints affect sequencing and safety planning.

7.3 Submittals, Shop Drawings, and Field-Ready Documentation

The Proposer shall develop and maintain a comprehensive submittal program for all equipment, materials, and installation work. Submittals shall be organized to support timely review and field execution, including shop drawings, manufacturer data, wiring and control diagrams, network architectures, installation instructions, and interface details.

Submittals shall clearly identify required interfaces to structural, architectural, electrical, mechanical, fire/life safety, controls/software, IT/network, and O&M access requirements. Submittals that omit interface requirements or assume “typical coordination” without documented details are not acceptable. The Proposer shall ensure that submittals are internally coordinated across disciplines and are suitable for field installation without interpretation, improvisation, or missing information.

Installation-Ready Standard. Submittals shall be treated as field execution documents. Any submittal package that lacks required interface definition, field dimensions/clearances, connection details, access/service clearances, or coordination notes necessary for installation shall be considered incomplete and shall be revised at the Proposer’s expense prior to installation. The Proposer shall not proceed with installation based on incomplete or “typical” submittals.

7.4 Fabrication Planning, Long-Lead Strategy, and Supply Chain Controls

The Proposer shall plan fabrication and procurement to avoid schedule and operational risk. For any long-lead or specialized components (including but not limited to shuttles/AGVs, lifts, pallet handling systems, control cabinets, safety PLCs, specialized sensors, and custom steel assemblies), the Proposer shall define procurement timing, manufacturing location(s), shipping methods, and quality checkpoints.

Where component sourcing is international, the Proposer shall plan accordingly and provide practical mitigation measures in the execution plan (for example: modular spares, redundant pathways, alternative suppliers where feasible, staged deliveries, loaner programs, or approved stocking programs). The City expects that supply chain realities will be managed proactively through planning and verification, not treated as unavoidable surprises during installation or operations.

Installation-Ready Standard. Submittals shall be treated as field execution documents. Any submittal package that lacks required interface definition, field dimensions/clearances, connection details, access/service clearances, or coordination notes necessary for installation shall be considered incomplete and shall be revised at the Proposer’s expense prior to installation. The Proposer shall not proceed with installation based on incomplete or “typical” submittals.

7.5 Factory Acceptance Planning and Pre-Shipment Verification

Prior to shipment of major AVSRS equipment, the Proposer shall implement a factory-level verification process appropriate to the complexity of the proposed system. Factory-level verification shall be used to reduce field troubleshooting, prevent integration failures, and ensure that core components (hardware and controls) meet documented specifications before they are delivered to the site.

Factory-level verification shall include confirmation that:

- Major mechanical components function as intended under expected loads and cycles.
- Safety devices and interlocks operate correctly.
- Control logic, communication, and sensor systems are stable and correctly mapped.
- Software versions and configurations are documented and controlled.
- Components are properly labeled and packaged to support site installation and commissioning.

This process shall not be treated as a marketing demonstration. It is intended to reduce field risk and prevent avoidable commissioning delays.

7.6 Site Logistics, Staging, Access, and Temporary Works

The Proposer shall plan and manage site logistics with sufficient detail to prevent delays, unsafe conditions, and installation conflicts. This includes identification of staging areas, delivery routes, rigging plans, crane or lift access, temporary supports, and site safety controls. Where the project involves retrofit within an existing structure, the Proposer shall identify access limitations and propose realistic means to deliver and install large components without compromising the structure or requiring unplanned removals.

Temporary works—including shoring, bracing, temporary platforms, hoisting points, protective barriers, and safety zones—shall be planned as part of the execution approach and shall be coordinated with structural and safety requirements. The Proposer shall not assume that the site can provide unlimited laydown space or unrestricted access.

7.7 Demolition, Selective Removal, and Retrofit Coordination (If Applicable)

Where the Proposer's approach includes demolition or selective removal, the Proposer shall define a controlled process that identifies what is to be removed, what is to remain, and how remaining elements will be protected and verified prior to proceeding with installation.

For retrofit approaches, the Proposer shall confirm field conditions at appropriate checkpoints and shall coordinate any structural modifications required for anchorage, alignment, clearances, power distribution, or access. The intent is to avoid a common AVSRS failure mode in which field conditions are discovered late and require redesign of key system elements during installation.

7.8 Installation Sequencing, Tolerance Management, and Alignment Controls

AVSRS installation success depends heavily on sequencing, tolerances, and alignment. The Proposer shall define an installation sequence that is technically feasible and that limits rework. The sequence shall address installation of structural supports and anchors (as applicable), guide rails, lifts, shuttle/AGV paths, pallet transfer mechanisms, sensors, gates/doors, control cabinets, wiring, communications networks, and safety devices.

The Proposer shall incorporate tolerance management into the installation plan, including methods for verifying alignment, calibration of sensors and positioning systems, and validation of travel paths prior to introducing vehicles. Installation shall not proceed in a manner that locks in misalignment or makes later correction impractical. The intent is to prevent failures that only become visible during commissioning when adjustment is costly and disruptive.

Alignment and Verification Records. The Proposer shall implement a documented metrology and alignment verification program suitable to the AVSRS architecture, including baseline surveys, interim checks, and final verification prior to energized motion testing. Verification records shall be retained and provided to the City upon request, including measurement locations, acceptance tolerances, corrective actions taken, and confirmation that alignment is stable prior to commissioning.

7.9 Controls, Software, IT/Network Integration, and Version Control

The Proposer shall furnish all controls hardware and software necessary to deliver a fully functional Automated Vehicle Storage and Retrieval System (AVSRS). This includes, at a minimum, system operating logic, safety and fail-safe logic, human-machine interfaces (HMI) for operators, monitoring and diagnostic dashboards, fault detection and reporting tools, and all software required for stable system operation. The system shall be capable of integrating with the City's existing or future Parking Access and Revenue Control System (PARCS), as well as any

City-designated or third-party monitoring platforms, regardless of whether the Proposer utilizes its own proprietary parking control system.

The Proposer shall maintain disciplined configuration and version control for all software and firmware, including documentation of versions deployed, change logs, and rollback procedures. Uncontrolled software changes during installation and commissioning are a common cause of unstable operations and shall be prevented through documented procedures.

Integration shall include confirmation of communications stability, cybersecurity considerations appropriate for networked equipment, and defined responsibilities for network equipment and interfaces.

Controlled Configuration Baseline. Prior to formal commissioning and acceptance testing, the Proposer shall establish a controlled configuration baseline for software, firmware, and critical parameters. Any change during commissioning shall be logged with reason, date, impacted functions, and verification steps, and shall trigger appropriate regression testing of affected functions before resuming acceptance testing.

7.10 Safety Systems, Emergency Operations, and Abnormal Condition Readiness

The AVSRS shall be installed and integrated with all required safety systems, interlocks, sensors, emergency stop functionality, and emergency access requirements. The Proposer shall ensure that safety systems are installed and verified as foundational elements, not treated as end-stage add-ons.

The installation and integration program shall explicitly prepare the system to handle abnormal and emergency conditions, including:

- Emergency stops during movement and safe stabilization of components.
- Power interruption and safe recovery without damaging equipment or vehicles.
- Fault conditions in sensors, positioning systems, or control logic without cascading impacts.
- Fire alarm events and other building emergency triggers where the system must enter a safe state.

The intent is to ensure that abnormal conditions are not first “discovered” during public operation.

7.11 Readiness Checks and Phase Gate Controls (No Backward Execution)

The Proposer shall implement readiness checks (“gates”) prior to proceeding to major execution steps, including but not limited to:

- Beginning installation of major equipment.
- Introducing energized testing of moving systems.
- Introducing test vehicles into the system.
- Beginning integrated system operation.

Readiness checks shall confirm that prerequisites are complete and verified (including alignment, wiring verification, sensor mapping, safety interlocks, communication stability, and documented procedures). These checks are intended to prevent avoidable failures and rework and to protect both the City and the Proposer by ensuring that the project does not proceed into high-risk activities prematurely. Execution shall not rely on repeated disassembly, reconfiguration, or redesign to correct avoidable sequencing or installation errors.

Gate Sign-Off Documentation. Each readiness gate shall include a checklist and sign-off record identifying prerequisites verified, outstanding items (if any), responsible personnel, and the basis for proceeding. Gate documentation is intended to prevent rework and disputes by clearly memorializing readiness conditions before high-risk activities begin.

7.12 Documentation During Installation and Field Change Control

The Proposer shall maintain accurate installation records, including installation checklists, calibration records, inspection logs, and updates to drawings reflecting field conditions. Where field adjustments occur, the Proposer shall document the changes and confirm that they remain consistent with design intent and do not introduce new operational or maintenance risks.

Field modifications to core system architecture, routing logic, safety systems, or interfaces shall not be treated as informal. The Proposer shall employ documented change control to avoid introducing inconsistencies that later compromise reliability. Field modifications that are not captured in updated drawings, configuration records, and O&M documentation shall be considered incomplete work and shall be corrected as part of close-out.

7.13 Training Preparation, Turnover Planning, and Operational Readiness Integration

Installation and integration shall be planned with turnover and operational readiness in mind. The Proposer shall coordinate training preparation, draft O&M procedures, and operational readiness tasks in parallel with late-stage installation so that turnover is not rushed or incomplete.

The Proposer shall plan operator training and maintenance orientation to reflect real operating conditions and failure recovery needs, including abnormal operations and safe manual intervention. Training shall be aligned with the final installed system configuration and software versioning. Be clear what City's vendor or authorized representative can be trained to do vs. not do, providing a clear demarcation. Allow enough to allow system to operate.

7.14 Coordination With Testing and Commissioning Requirements

The Proposer shall coordinate installation and integration activities to support successful testing and commissioning. The design intent, field installation, controls configuration, sensor calibration, and safety systems must be consistent and stable prior to formal commissioning tests.

The City's expectation is that commissioning is used to validate a properly installed and integrated system, not to troubleshoot fundamental installation errors or incomplete integration. Accordingly, installation and integration activities shall be planned to reduce commissioning risk and prevent avoidable delays.

7.15 Deliverables and Execution-Phase Documentation (Minimum Requirements)

During fabrication, construction, installation, and integration, the Proposer shall maintain and deliver documentation sufficient to demonstrate completeness and readiness. At minimum, execution-phase deliverables shall include:

- Installation sequencing plan and logistics approach
- Submittal and shop drawing log
- Factory-level verification documentation (as applicable)
- Delivery, staging, and rigging plan
- Calibration and alignment verification records
- Safety system installation and verification records
- Controls/software version log and configuration documentation
- Field change documentation and updated drawings
- Draft training materials and turnover plan aligned to the installed system

Deliverables shall be organized in a manner that supports City review and later operational use.

SECTION 8 – TESTING, COMMISSIONING, ACCEPTANCE, CLOSE-OUT (POST-AWARD SCOPE)

8.1 Purpose and Acceptance Philosophy

Following completion of fabrication, construction, and installation activities, the Proposer shall execute a structured testing and commissioning program to demonstrate that the AVSRS is safe, stable, reliable, maintainable, and ready for continuous public operation. Testing and commissioning shall validate a properly designed and installed system and shall not be used to compensate for incomplete design resolution, poor installation practices, unresolved interfaces, or uncontrolled software changes.

System Testing and Validation

The AVSRS shall undergo documented, continuous operational testing demonstrating reliable performance across all parking locations within the garage. At a minimum, the system shall successfully complete **five (5) full operational cycles per designed parking space of 200 (or whichever is vendor project capacity goal) vehicles**, consisting of:

1. vehicle entry and automated parking, and
2. vehicle retrieval and exit.

Testing shall be conducted consecutively without unresolved errors or interruptions. All test results, logs, and performance data shall be **fully documented**, remain **the property of the City**, and be made available to the City for review at any time during the testing and validation period.

Acceptance is intended to confirm operational readiness under both normal and abnormal conditions. The AVSRS must demonstrate predictable behavior, safe failure responses, and practical recovery methods suitable for real-world public use. Passing isolated tests without demonstrating system stability is not sufficient for acceptance.

8.2 Commissioning Plan and Test Governance

The Proposer shall prepare a commissioning plan that establishes the overall testing framework, sequencing, prerequisites, roles and responsibilities, and documentation requirements. The plan shall identify the logical order of testing (component tests → subsystem tests → integrated functional tests → operational simulations → acceptance tests) and shall define objective pass/fail criteria for each stage.

Testing shall be governed by documented procedures, controlled software versions, and formal test records. The Proposer shall maintain a single “system configuration baseline” during acceptance testing, including defined software/firmware versions and parameter settings. Software, firmware, and parameter settings used during testing shall be identified, logged, and controlled. Any changes during commissioning shall be documented and shall trigger appropriate retesting of impacted functions. Should involve a throughput-controlled test 110 cars per hour. And retrieve 110. Ask vendor.

8.3 Pre-Commissioning Readiness Gates (No Testing Before the System is Ready)

Before initiating any energized movement, test vehicle operations, or integrated system testing, the Proposer shall complete readiness checks to confirm that prerequisites have been met. These readiness checks are intended to prevent premature testing that creates damage, unreliable results, or unsafe conditions.

Readiness checks shall verify at the minimum:

- **Mechanical readiness:** alignment, tolerances, lubrication, fasteners, and travel paths verified and documented

- **Electrical readiness:** power quality, grounding, emergency power interfaces (if applicable), and protection devices verified
- **Controls readiness:** sensor mapping, actuator addressing, safety PLC configuration, and interlocks verified
- **Safety readiness:** e-stops, guard systems, access controls, and fault-state behavior validated for safe stop conditions
- **Communications readiness:** network stability, redundancy expectations, data logging, and monitoring connectivity verified
- **Documentation readiness:** current drawings, test procedures, configuration, and checklists available for the testing team

Testing shall not proceed into higher-risk stages unless prerequisites are satisfied and documented. Readiness confirmation shall address, at minimum, mechanical alignment and tolerances, electrical verification, sensor mapping, control logic verification, safety system installation, communication stability, and availability of current documentation. Testing shall not proceed to higher-risk activities unless readiness conditions are satisfied and documented. Readiness documentation shall be retained as part of the commissioning record and made available to the City upon request.

8.4 Component and Subsystem Testing (Factory and Field)

The Proposer shall test individual components and subsystems to confirm correct function prior to integrated system operations. Testing shall include mechanical components (lifts, shuttles/AGVs, pallet transfer mechanisms), electrical components (drives, panels, power distribution), control hardware (PLCs, sensors, safety controllers), and software modules (HMI, diagnostics, logging, alarms).

Component and subsystem testing shall confirm at the minimum:

- Correct directional movement and positioning
- Sensor detection accuracy and stability
- Safety system response to expected triggers
- Fault detection and correct alarm reporting
- Correct interlock behavior under restricted conditions

Testing at this stage shall be structured to isolate and resolve issues before system-wide integration. Component and subsystem testing shall be structured to isolate issues early and prevent propagation of faults into later testing stages. Recurring or systemic issues identified during later acceptance testing shall be considered evidence of inadequate subsystem verification.

8.5 Integrated Functional Testing (End-to-End Behavior)

After subsystem verification, the Proposer shall conduct integrated functional testing to demonstrate that the AVSRS functions end-to-end, including vehicle intake, storage assignment, movement through the system, retrieval, and vehicle delivery at exit.

Integrated functional testing shall confirm at the minimum:

- Consistent operation across all entry/exit bays and operating modes
- Accurate vehicle tracking and inventory control logic (no “lost vehicle” states)
- Correct routing logic for lifts, shuttles/AGVs, pallets, and transfer mechanisms
- Stable and predictable cycle behavior without repeated manual resets
- Correct operation of user-facing devices (doors, kiosks, sensors, signage, displays as applicable)
- Correct system response to faults, including safe stop and controlled recovery logic

Integrated functional testing shall be performed using the system configuration baseline intended for acceptance testing.

8.6 Safety Validation and Hazard Condition Testing

Safety validation shall be treated as a core acceptance element, not a documentation exercise. The Proposer shall verify that safety systems, interlocks, guarding, emergency stops, alarms, and abnormal behavior protections operate as intended.

Safety validation shall include testing of:

- Emergency stop behavior at representative locations and during representative motion states
- Guarding and access control interlocks, including entry bay protection logic
- Safety PLC behavior and correct fault-state transitions
- Safe state behavior during loss of communications, sensor failure, or drive faults
- Restart and recovery logic following safety events (including verification that the system does not resume movement in an unsafe state)
- Fire/life safety interface behavior, where applicable, including required safe-state responses

The Proposer shall document tested scenarios, results, corrective actions, and retests. Testing shall demonstrate safe system behavior during emergency stops, loss of communications, sensor faults, drive failures, and applicable fire or building emergency signals. Restart and recovery behavior shall confirm that the system does not resume operation in an unsafe state.

8.7 Abnormal, Degraded, and Failure-State Operational Testing

To ensure the system is truly operationally ready, acceptance preparation shall include testing of representative abnormal and degraded conditions. Acceptance preparation shall include testing of representative abnormal and degraded operating conditions. The AVSRS shall demonstrate controlled behavior and practical recovery without destructive disassembly or prolonged instability.

Testing shall include scenarios such as (at the minimum):

- Single shuttle/AGV unavailability and re-routing behavior
- Single lift unavailability and throughput impacts with defined fallback behavior
- Pallet misalignment or transfer fault and recovery workflow
- Sensor fault behavior including safe stop, alarm, and recovery steps
- Software or communication interruption behavior and controlled restart
- Mid-cycle stop conditions and safe stabilization of moving elements
- Controlled recovery following emergency shutdown conditions

As part of this testing, the Proposer shall demonstrate that recovery procedures are practical and align with the manual intervention strategies defined during design.

8.8 Vehicle Recovery Demonstrations and Manual Intervention Procedures

The Proposer shall demonstrate vehicle recovery procedures for representative non-routine scenarios to confirm that vehicles can be retrieved safely without dismantling large portions of the system. Demonstrations shall include both planned recovery actions and controlled response to representative faults that immobilize vehicles.

Vehicle recovery demonstrations shall confirm at the minimum:

- Safe access methods for personnel (including lockout/tagout awareness in procedures)
- Tools and equipment required for recovery actions
- Approximate recovery durations (reasonable assumptions) and staffing requirements
- Clear decision logic for when to attempt recovery versus when to isolate and reroute operations
- Documentation of recovery steps suitable for operations staff use

The intent is to ensure that recovery is not dependent on specialized knowledge held by a single technician and is not so complex that it becomes impractical during real operations.

8.9 Operational Simulations, Peak Period Behavior, and Queue Risk Validation

The Proposer shall demonstrate system behavior under representative operational conditions, including uneven arrival patterns, repeated park-and-retrieve sequences, and partial subsystem outages. Simulations shall confirm that system logic remains coherent and recoverable under realistic public-use conditions.

Operational simulations shall address, at minimum:

- Repeated mixed sequences of park-and-retrieve cycles across entry/exit bays
- Queue management logic at entry and exit points (as applicable to the proposed design)
- Behavior when one or more subsystems are offline (degraded mode)
- Recovery of normal operations following a controlled fault event

This testing is intended to reveal operational logic weaknesses that would otherwise appear only after public opening.

8.10 Reliability Demonstration Period (Stability, Not Just One-Time Success)

The Proposer shall conduct a reliability demonstration period intended to confirm operational stability over time rather than isolated success. The demonstration shall include repeated cycles, sustained operation, and logging of faults, alarms, interventions, and resets.

The reliability demonstration shall include:

- A sustained test period of consecutive operational hours or days, as appropriate to the proposed system complexity
- A defined number of consecutive successful cycles without safety-critical faults or uncontrolled resets
- Logging that identifies all faults, alarms, interventions, and corrective actions during the demonstration

The Proposer shall propose reliability demonstration criteria appropriate to the system architecture and justify their adequacy. Criteria shall be reviewed for reasonableness and completeness.

8.11 Data Logging, Reporting, and Acceptance Documentation

Testing shall be supported by robust data logging. The system shall record and report events including (as applicable): faults, alarms, safety triggers, emergency stops, manual interventions, system resets, operator logins, and key operational events.

Acceptance documentation shall include, at minimum:

- Test procedures executed and dates performed
- Pass/fail results and supporting logs
- Corrective actions taken and retest evidence
- Final configuration baseline (software/firmware versions, critical parameters)
- As-built drawings or final documentation reflecting installed conditions
- Operator and maintenance manuals and training materials aligned with the final system
- A list of remaining punch-list items and plan for completion (if any)

The objective is to ensure the City receives a complete operating record and a system that can be supported without reliance on undocumented configurations.

8.12 Training, Turnover, and Operational Readiness as Acceptance Preconditions

Proposer to describe the details of the City's operator and maintenance training as part of the turnover process. Training shall be practical and aligned with the final installed system and final software configuration. Training shall include normal operations, abnormal operations, manual intervention, vehicle recovery, and safe shutdown/restart procedures.

Provide the number of proposed times, details, and schedule of training.

Operational readiness materials shall be provided in a format usable by City staff or the City's designated authorized operator or representatives, including clear step-by-step procedures and escalation guidance for faults.

8.13 Close-Out Walkthrough, and Completion Checklist

Following completion of installation, integration, and pre-acceptance testing, the Proposer shall conduct formal construction administration and close-out activities to confirm that the AVSRS has been delivered in a complete, safe, and operable condition consistent with the approved design and tested configuration.

The Proposer shall perform a structured close-out walkthrough with the City (and the City's designated representatives, as applicable). The purpose of the walkthrough is to verify physical completeness, accessibility, maintainability, safety readiness, and documentation accuracy prior to Final Acceptance. This walkthrough is not a substitute for commissioning or testing, but a confirmation that the system, as installed and tested, is ready for long-term operation.

Scope of Close-Out Walkthrough

The close-out walkthrough shall include, at a minimum, verification of the following:

- Installation completeness of all AVSRS components, including lifts, shuttles/AGVs, pallet handling systems, entry/exit equipment, control cabinets, sensors, gates/doors, signage, and safety devices.
- Safe access and clearances for operations and maintenance personnel, including access panels, service platforms, ladders, walkways, lighting, and lockout/tagout points.
- Proper labeling of equipment, safety devices, emergency stops, control panels, and access points in a manner consistent with operating and maintenance documentation.
- Confirmation that the installed configuration matches the configuration used during testing and commissioning, including mechanical alignment, sensor locations, control logic, and software/firmware versions.
- Verification that temporary construction measures, tools, supports, or staging elements have been removed and that the system is in a permanent operating condition.

Completion Checklist and Documentation

The Proposer shall prepare and submit a written close-out checklist documenting the results of the walkthrough. A written completion checklist shall document reviewed items, remaining open items, and planned resolution actions. Completion of close-out activities is a prerequisite to Final Acceptance.

The close-out checklist shall be accompanied by confirmation that required documentation has been delivered or is ready for delivery, including:

- Final as-built scaled drawings reflecting installed conditions
- Final equipment schedules and interface documentation
- Final operating and maintenance manuals aligned with the installed system
- Training materials corresponding to the final configuration
- Configuration baseline documentation, including software and firmware versions
- Final most updated AutoCAD, Revit Files

Incomplete or missing documentation shall be identified during close-out rather than deferred until after acceptance.

Relationship to Acceptance

Completion of the close-out walkthrough and submission of the completed checklist are prerequisites to Final Acceptance. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that acceptance is

based on a fully delivered and verified system, rather than on assumptions that remaining items will be resolved later.

The City's participation in the close-out walkthrough does not relieve the Proposer of responsibility for completeness or accuracy. The Proposer remains responsible for ensuring that all system elements necessary for safe, reliable, and maintainable operation have been provided.

8.14 Acceptance Framework and Completion Criteria

Final Acceptance shall be based on successful completion of testing, commissioning, training, documentation delivery, and demonstration of stable system operation. Acceptance shall confirm that the AVSRS is ready for public use without unresolved critical instability or missing operational information.

The acceptance framework shall include at the minimum:

- Successful completion of component/subsystem tests
- Successful completion of integrated functional tests
- Successful completion of safety and abnormal-condition tests
- Successful completion of vehicle recovery demonstrations
- Completion of the reliability demonstration period under the agreed criteria
- Delivery of required documentation, baseline configuration information, and training

8.15 Warranty Readiness and Post-Acceptance Support Planning (Scope-Level)

The Proposer shall coordinate the commissioning and acceptance program to transition cleanly into post-acceptance support. The Proposer shall identify how warranty support will be initiated, how issues will be tracked during early and future operations, and how post-acceptance monitoring and response will be coordinated.

8.16 Minimum Deliverables (Commissioning Package)

At minimum, the Proposer shall provide executed test records, safety validation results, abnormal-condition testing documentation, vehicle recovery procedures, reliability demonstration results, configuration baseline documentation, final manuals, and training materials. Such items include at the minimum:

- Commissioning plan and test matrix
- Executed test records with logs
- Safety validation documentation and retest records
- Abnormal/degraded mode test scenarios and results
- Vehicle recovery procedures and demonstration results
- Reliability demonstration criteria and results
- Final configuration baseline and version logs
- Final manuals, training materials, and turnover documentation

SECTION 9 – OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, REPORTING, AND OWNER VISIBILITY

9.1 Purpose and Lifecycle Intent

Following Final Acceptance, the Proposer shall provide ongoing operations support and maintenance services necessary to keep the AVSRS safe, reliable, and suitable for continuous public use. This Section defines the City's expectations for how the system shall be supported over time, including maintenance practices, reporting transparency, and owner access to operational information.

The City's intent is that maintenance and operational support be proactive, well-documented, and transparent. The AVSRS is expected to operate as a long-term public asset, and maintenance practices shall be structured to support system longevity, predictable performance, and informed owner oversight rather than reactive troubleshooting.

Provide the number of years that your proposed AVSRS over a period of time:

- a. Anticipated useful life of the structure, equipment, software
- b. Maximum warranty limit
- c. Included years of Maintenance and Support (describe)
- d. Extended years of Maintenance and Support (describe)

9.2 Operations Support and System Oversight

The Proposer shall provide operational support appropriate to the complexity of the installed AVSRS. Operational support includes monitoring system condition, responding to alerts and fault conditions, supporting operator questions, and assisting with abnormal or degraded operation scenarios.

Operational support shall be structured so that issues affecting safety, availability, or user experience are identified and addressed promptly. The Proposer shall describe how operational support is provided, including typical response pathways, escalation procedures, and coordination with on-site or City-designated operating staff.

The City does not expect to rely solely on vendor intervention for routine operations; however, the City does expect that the Proposer's support structure is capable of addressing both routine and non-routine system conditions efficiently.

Operational support shall explicitly address day-to-day abnormal conditions that may occur during public operation, including partial and extended outages, recover events to ensure safe system stabilization, degraded performance modes, manual interventions, temporary workarounds, and orderly return to service. The Proposer's operational support approach shall demonstrate that such conditions can be managed safely and predictably without requiring prolonged system shutdowns or ad hoc decision-making.

Operational oversight shall include the ability to distinguish between informational alerts, maintenance-level faults, and conditions requiring immediate operational response, so that system issues are handled proportionately and without unnecessary disruption to users.

9.3 Preventive Maintenance Program

The Proposer shall implement a structured preventive maintenance program designed specifically for automated parking systems. Preventive maintenance shall be based on manufacturer recommendations, operational experience, and observed wear patterns, and shall be adjusted as needed based on system usage and performance history.

Preventive maintenance activities shall include, as applicable:

- Inspection, lubrication, and adjustment of mechanical components
- Verification and calibration of sensors and positioning systems
- Inspection and testing of safety devices and interlocks
- Review of control system diagnostics and alarms
- Verification of communication and network stability
- Review of component condition to identify early signs of wear or degradation

Preventive maintenance shall be planned and executed to minimize disruption to public operations while maintaining system reliability.

The preventive maintenance program shall be structured to reduce the likelihood of in-service failures during peak public usage periods. Maintenance planning shall consider operational hours, usage intensity, and component duty cycles, rather than relying solely on fixed calendar intervals.

Preventive maintenance activities shall be documented in sufficient detail to demonstrate that inspections and adjustments are addressing known AVSRS wear points and failure precursors, not merely satisfying generic checklist requirements.

9.4 Corrective Maintenance and Repair Practices

Corrective maintenance shall address faults, failures, and abnormal conditions identified during operations or preventive maintenance activities. The Proposer shall establish repair practices that prioritize safety, system stability, and timely restoration of service.

Repair practices shall include defined approaches for:

- Isolating faults without unnecessarily shutting down unaffected portions of the system
- Implementing temporary workarounds where appropriate to restore partial service
- Performing permanent repairs in a manner consistent with design intent and safety requirements
- Verifying system stability and correct operation following repairs

The City expects that corrective maintenance is documented thoroughly and that recurring issues are identified and addressed systematically rather than repeatedly treated as isolated events.

Corrective maintenance practices shall include clear differentiation between faults that require immediate intervention and those that can be scheduled without materially affecting public operation. Where degraded operation is used as a temporary measure, the Proposer shall ensure that such modes are safe, intentional, and clearly documented.

The City expects that corrective maintenance practices evolve over time based on observed system behavior, recurring fault patterns, and lessons learned, rather than remaining static.

9.5 Maintenance and Repair Logging (Required)

The Proposer shall maintain a comprehensive maintenance and repair log for the AVSRS. The log shall record all maintenance and service activities performed on the system, including preventive maintenance, corrective repairs, emergency interventions, component replacements, and software or configuration changes.

Each log entry shall, at a minimum, record:

- Date and time of the activity
- Nature of the work performed
- Reason for the work (scheduled, fault-driven, emergency, follow-up)
- Components or subsystems affected
- Personnel performing the work
- Duration of any service interruption or degraded operation
- Actions taken to restore normal operation

The maintenance and repair log shall clearly identify periods of full outage, partial outage, and degraded operation, including the start and end time of each condition. The intent is to allow the City to understand not only what work was performed, but how system availability was affected over time, what parts are regularly or not regularly requiring maintenance and repair, and inform future budget planning.

9.6 Real-Time Owner Access to Maintenance and Operational Records

The City shall have real-time, read-only access to maintenance and operational records through a web-based dashboard or equivalent electronic system. Owner access shall allow the City to view current and historical maintenance activities, open and closed service items, fault history, and system status indicators.

Owner access shall support data review for operational oversight, budgeting, auditing, and long-term planning. The City shall be able to export maintenance and repair data in commonly used formats for independent analysis.

Proposers shall clearly state whether owner access to dashboards, portals, or reporting systems is included as part of their standard maintenance service or subject to additional fees. Any recurring or one-time costs associated with owner access, data retention, or reporting tools shall be explicitly identified in the proposal.

Owner access shall include visibility into system availability status, including indicators for normal operation, degraded operation, and outage conditions. Where dashboards or portals include alert thresholds or performance indicators, these shall be described so that the City can interpret system condition without specialized vendor intervention.

9.7 Reporting, Trend Analysis, and Lifecycle Visibility

In addition to real-time access, the Proposer shall provide periodic summary reporting that highlights system performance trends, maintenance activity, recurring issues, and emerging risks. Reports shall be structured to support informed decision-making rather than simply listing completed tasks.

Reporting shall address, at a minimum:

- Summary of preventive and corrective maintenance activities
- Frequency and nature of faults or alarms
- Identification of recurring issues or components requiring repeated attention
- Observed trends that may affect reliability or lifecycle costs
- Recommendations for adjustments to maintenance practices or component replacement strategies
- Emergency, unusual, or safety-related system concerns, faults, or alarms to notify the City immediately without delay

The City expects reporting to be analytical and forward-looking, supporting proactive management of the asset.

Trend analysis shall include commentary on operational impacts, such as whether recurring maintenance issues are affecting throughput, retrieval times, or public experience. Reports shall highlight not only what occurred, but why patterns may be developing and what preventive actions are recommended.

9.8 Spare Parts, Critical Components, and Repair Readiness

The Proposer shall describe its approach to spare parts management and repair readiness. This includes identification of components that are subject to regular wear, components whose failure could significantly affect system availability, and components that require special handling or

extended lead times. Preference will be given to locally source parts or vendors showing ability to access parts on a timely manner without slowing the performance of or closing garage.

The Proposer shall explain how repair readiness is maintained, including availability of commonly required parts, access to specialized tools, and coordination of technical expertise. Where components cannot be reasonably stocked due to size, cost, or fabrication constraints, the Proposer shall describe how repair timelines and interim operational strategies are managed. This requirement is intended to ensure that maintenance planning reflects practical realities and does not rely on undefined or unrealistic assumptions about part availability.

For components whose failure could immobilize vehicles or significantly reduce system availability, the Proposer shall describe practical recovery assumptions, including typical staffing requirements and approximate restoration durations under representative conditions. These assumptions are intended for planning transparency and lifecycle understanding, not as performance guarantees.

9.9 Software Maintenance, Updates, and Configuration Control

The Proposer shall maintain the AVSRS software and control systems in a stable and supported condition. Software maintenance shall include correction of defects, updates necessary to maintain compatibility or security, and controlled enhancements where appropriate.

All software updates shall be documented, including version identification, purpose of the update, and confirmation of successful deployment. Configuration changes shall be tracked to preserve system stability and to ensure that maintenance and recovery procedures remain accurate.

Software maintenance practices shall ensure that updates do not invalidate existing operating procedures in a disciplined manner that minimizes operational disruption, recovery workflows, or training materials without corresponding updates. The City expects that software evolution does not outpace documentation and operational readiness.

9.10 Coordination With City Staff and Designated Operators

The Proposer shall coordinate maintenance and operations support with City staff or the City's designated operator. Communication protocols shall be clear, including how issues are reported, how service requests are initiated, and how status updates are provided.

The City expects that coordination supports transparency and collaboration, allowing the City to understand system condition without requiring specialized technical interpretation of raw data.

9.11 Knowledge Transfer, Documentation Updates, and Continuity

Maintenance and operations support shall include ongoing knowledge transfer to the City or designated operator. Documentation shall be kept current to reflect changes in system configuration, software versions, or maintenance procedures.

This includes updates to operating manuals, maintenance instructions, recovery procedures, and training materials as the system evolves. The intent is to prevent operational knowledge from becoming fragmented or dependent on individual personnel.

Knowledge transfer shall be structured so that operational continuity is not dependent on individual personnel familiarity. Procedures and documentation shall be sufficiently clear that qualified operators can respond effectively to both routine and abnormal conditions. Documentation, training materials, and operational procedures shall be maintained at a level sufficient to support continuity of operations in the event of a transition in operating or

maintenance responsibility. System knowledge shall not be dependent on proprietary practices known only to a limited subset of personnel.

9.12 Relationship to Acceptance and Long-Term Operations

The maintenance and operations practices described in this Section shall be consistent with the system configuration and procedures validated during testing and acceptance. Transition from acceptance into ongoing operations shall be deliberate and coordinated to avoid gaps in support or documentation. This Section defines the City's expectations for ongoing stewardship of the AVSRS as a long-term public asset and establishes a transparent framework for maintenance, reporting, and owner oversight.

9.13 System Openness, Transferability, and Continuity of Control

The AVSRS shall not be delivered or operated in a manner that prevents the City, or a future owner of the facility, from maintaining continued control and operational continuity of the system.

While the City recognizes that AVSRS software and controls may include proprietary components, the system shall not rely on closed architectures, undisclosed dependencies, or restrictive access practices that would make it impractical for a qualified third-party provider to assume operation, maintenance, or support of the system in the future.

The Proposer shall design and operate the system such that, upon reasonable transition, City or a qualified third party could:

- Operate the system safely and reliably;
- Access operational and maintenance records;
- Perform routine and corrective maintenance;
- Manage system configuration, diagnostics, and recovery procedures;
- Maintain system functionality without requiring exclusive reliance on the original Proposer; and
- Format a easy to read and understand use of the associated Software, which vendor shall adjust as necessary for this purpose before the transfer date free of charge to the City or the authorized transfer party.

The intent of this requirement is not to require disclosure of proprietary source code or trade secrets, but to prevent operational lock-in that would compromise long-term asset stewardship.

Proposer shall provide software code escrow, subject to final agreement.

9.14 Ownership Transfer and Continuity of Ownership

The City does not anticipate a change in ownership or operational control of the facility. However, in the event that ownership or operational responsibility were to change at any point during the service life of the AVSRS, the system shall be designed, documented, and supported in a manner that allows for an orderly transition of operations and maintenance responsibility to a successor owner or operator.

The intent of this requirement is to ensure long-term continuity of system operation and asset stewardship. Proposers shall not assume exclusive or non-transferable control of system operations, data, diagnostics, or maintenance practices that would prevent a qualified successor from operating and maintaining the system using the documentation, tools, and procedures provided. This provision does not require disclosure of proprietary source code or trade secrets, but does require that the system not be rendered inoperable, unsupported, or impractical to maintain solely due to a change in ownership or operating entity.

PART C

Proposal Content & Response Requirement

PART C- PROPOSAL CONTENT

SECTION 10 – PURPOSAL FORMAT AND ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

10.1 Proposal Organization and Required Structure

Proposals shall be organized in the order specified below. Each section shall be clearly labeled and presented in the sequence identified. Proposers shall not reorder sections, combine sections, or substitute alternative formats.

The City intends to evaluate proposals based on the clarity, completeness, and responsiveness of the submitted information. Failure to follow the required organization may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive or receiving reduced evaluation scores.

The total proposal shall not exceed **thirty (30) pages**, excluding the following, which do **not** count toward the page limit. At a minimum, proposals shall include the following major sections and shall submit **Electronic format (PDF) in one (1) zipped file in PlanetBids**.

1. Cover Letter
2. Table of Contents
3. Executive Summary
4. Proposer Qualifications and Experience, Include Hyperlink/s to Active Video (Section 11)
5. Technical Approach and Methodology (Part C requirements)
6. Project Team and Key Personnel
7. Schedule and Phasing Narrative
8. Operations and Maintenance Approach
9. Pricing Narrative
10. Required Forms and Certifications
11. Excel: Form 1, Form 2, Form 3
12. Confidential or trade secret materials to be clearly marked.

Information shall be presented concisely and shall directly address the requirements of this RFP. Marketing language, generic corporate descriptions, and promotional material unrelated to the City's evaluation criteria are discouraged and may not be considered. The City reserves the right to disregard material that exceeds page limits or does not comply with formatting requirements.

10.2 Page Limits, Font, and Formatting Requirements

To ensure fairness and facilitate side-by-side evaluation, proposals shall comply with the following mandatory formatting requirements

- Paper size shall be **8.5 inches by 11 inches**.
- Minimum font size shall be **10-point**, using a standard, legible font such as **Arial, Calibri, or Times New Roman**.
- Margins shall be no less than **one inch (.5")** on all sides.
- Text shall be single-spaced or 1.15 spaced.
- Pages shall be sequentially numbered.
- Graphics, tables, and charts shall be readable and included within page limits unless otherwise stated.

10.3 Submission Method, Deadline, and Delivery Requirements

Proposals shall be submitted in accordance with the instructions and deadlines identified in **Part A – RFP Timeline and Procurement Schedule**. Proposals received after the stated deadline will not be accepted, regardless of cause. It is the sole responsibility of the Proposer to ensure timely delivery.

10.4 Proposal Validity Period

Proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall remain valid and irrevocable for a minimum period of **three hundred and sixty-five (365) calendar days** following the Proposal Due Date. The City reserves the right to request an extension of the proposal validity period. Failure to agree to a reasonable extension may result in removal from further consideration.

10.5 Confidential and Trade Secret Information

Proposers may designate portions of their submission as confidential or trade secret information in accordance with the California Public Records Act.

Confidential materials shall:

- Be clearly marked as “CONFIDENTIAL – TRADE SECRET”
- Be submitted **separately** from the main proposal
- Be limited strictly to proprietary technical data, drawings, or information that meets the legal definition of trade secret

Proposers are advised that the City cannot guarantee confidentiality and will comply with applicable public disclosure laws. Blanket confidentiality claims are not acceptable.

SECTION 11 – PROPOSERS QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

11.1 Firm Qualifications and Organizational Experience

Proposers shall demonstrate that they possess the organizational capability, technical expertise, and financial stability necessary to design, construct, install, and support a fully automated vehicle storage and retrieval system for long-term public use.

This section shall describe:

- The Proposer’s corporate structure and years in operation
- Primary business lines relevant to automated parking systems
- Experience delivering AVSRS projects of similar complexity
- The role of the Proposer as prime contractor versus system integrator or manufacturer

Joint ventures, partnerships, or subcontracting arrangements shall be clearly identified, including the scope of responsibility for each entity.

11.2 Comparable AVSRS Project Experience

Proposers shall provide detailed information for minimum of **one (1)** and up to **three (3)** comparable AVSRS projects completed or currently operating.

For each project, Proposers shall provide:

- Project name and physical location
- Owner/operator name and contact information (email and phone)
- Year placed into service (first year and most recent year of operation)
- System type and configuration
- Total number of parking spaces
- Whether the project involved retrofit, partial demolition, or new construction
- Current operational status

Projects submitted shall demonstrate relevance to the City’s project in terms of scale, public use, system automation level, and operational complexity.

The City reserves the right to contact references and conduct site visits.

11.3 Key Personnel and Project Team

Proposers shall identify all key personnel proposed for the Project, including but not limited to:

- Project Manager
- Lead Design Engineer(s)
- Controls / Software Lead

- Construction or Installation Manager
- Operations and Maintenance Lead (if applicable)

For each individual, Proposers shall provide:

- Role and responsibilities on this Project
- Relevant AVSRS experience
- Years of experience in automated systems
- Employer and reporting structure

Bios shall be included in an appendix and shall not exceed **half page per individual**.

The City expects that key personnel identified in the proposal will remain assigned to the Project through completion unless a substitution is approved.

11.4 Financial Capacity and Organizational Stability

Proposers shall demonstrate financial capacity sufficient to support the Project through design, construction, commissioning, and early operations.

This section shall include:

- Description of financial structure and stability
- Identification of any pending litigation or claims related to AVSRS projects
- Disclosure of any material adverse changes within the past five years

11.5 Subcontractors and Strategic Partners

Proposers shall identify all major subcontractors, system suppliers, or strategic partners proposed for this Project and describe their roles and responsibilities.

The City expects that critical system components and services are provided by entities with demonstrated AVSRS experience.

SECTION 12 – Technical and Management Approach

12.1 Proposed System Description

Proposers shall provide an executive summary concisely describing the proposed solution for the project. The executive summary shall identify the proposed system type, the overall delivery approach, and the key distinguishing characteristics of the proposal. The executive summary shall be consistent with, and supported by, the detailed narratives provided in subsequent sections.

12.2 Technical Approach and Proposed System Description

Proposers shall describe in detail the fully automated robotic parking system proposed for the project, including the fundamental operating concept, and major components. The description shall address vehicle handling methods, lifts, shuttles or transfer mechanisms, pallets (if applicable), control systems, sensors, and safety features.

The approach shall explain how the proposed system is suited to the project site and how it aligns with the City's performance, reliability, maintainability, and longevity objectives. Assumptions regarding structural conditions, utilities, fire and life safety requirements, and interfaces with City systems shall be clearly stated.

12.2.1 System Capacity and Performance Assumptions

The City's existing facility is currently designed for approximately **200 parking spaces, or the vendor capacity total**, with observed **peak occupancy of approximately 110 parked vehicles**.

As part of the Proposal, each Proposer shall identify the **optimal number of parking spaces** achievable under their proposed AVSRS solution for this specific project. The optimal capacity shall reflect the Proposer's recommended Total system configuration, considering operational efficiency, reliability, and lifecycle performance.

In addition, Proposers shall provide **estimated vehicle parking and retrieval times** based on the system operating at the Proposer's stated optimal capacity. Performance estimates shall address **both arrival and departure conditions** and shall assume system demand occurring within a **one-hour peak operating window**.

At a minimum, Proposers shall state:

- The **optimal total parking capacity** (number of vehicles) for the proposed system.
- The **estimated average time** (in minutes) to park a vehicle during peak arrival conditions.
- The **estimated average time** (in minutes) to retrieve a vehicle during peak departure conditions.
- Any **assumptions** used in developing these estimates, including but not limited to:
 - Number of levels
 - Number and location of entry/exit bays
 - Number and type of shuttles, lifts, or AGVs
 - System operating logic or sequencing assumptions
 - Any known throughput constraints or degraded-mode considerations

All estimates shall be specific to the Proposer's proposed system and configuration for the City's project and shall not be based on generic or theoretical system performance. The City will use this information to compare system capacity, throughput, and operational performance across Proposals.

12.3 Existing Structure Strategy and Proposed System Integration

Proposers shall clearly state whether their proposed approach assumes reuse of the existing structure, partial demolition and reconfiguration, or full demolition and replacement. The proposal shall explain the rationale for the selected approach and describe anticipated benefits and tradeoffs, including impacts on system capacity, constructability, schedule, lifecycle performance, and long-term operations.

Proposers shall identify key technical and logistical challenges associated with their selected approach and describe how such challenges would be addressed. The City seeks a clear articulation of implications rather than a predetermined solution.

12.4 Design and Construction Methodology

Proposers shall describe their overall methodology for delivering the project from initial design through construction, installation, testing, and turnover. This narrative shall demonstrate an understanding of the design phases described in Part B of the RFP and explain how design development will be managed in a disciplined, coordinated manner.

The proposal shall describe internal quality control procedures, interdisciplinary coordination, and review processes intended to minimize rework and downstream construction issues. Proposers shall explain how design decisions will be validated against performance, safety, maintainability, and failure-recovery considerations. Proposers shall clearly distinguish between assumptions that are verified versus those that would require confirmation during post-award design

12.5 Construction Staging, Site Logistics, and Installation Process

Proposers shall describe their anticipated approach to construction staging, site access, and installation logistics. This description shall address delivery and staging of major equipment, anticipated crane usage, laydown areas, sequencing of work, and coordination with surrounding uses.

The Proposer shall anticipate the need to maintain accessible (ADA-compliant) parking and designated delivery/loading access on-site throughout the construction and installation period. The proposal shall clearly describe how ADA access will be preserved at all times, including

temporary routing, signage, protection of accessible paths of travel, and coordination with City accessibility requirements.

The Proposer shall also address how delivery and service vehicle access will be maintained or temporarily accommodated during construction. Where temporary relocation of parking is required, the Proposer shall acknowledge that City employees may be temporarily relocated to the City-owned King's Parking Garage and shall coordinate construction staging accordingly.

The proposal shall identify any anticipated periods of reduced availability or downtime of the AVSRS facility, including which portions of the facility would be affected, the estimated duration of such impacts, and the measures proposed to minimize disruption to City operations, public access, and adjacent uses.

12.6 Provide AVSRS Parking Response Time Calculation Estimate

The fully automated system is to provide an efficient and effective performance in parking and retrieving vehicles during peak periods in the mornings and afternoons, commiserate to a typical office building with city employees and public parkers. The garage would fill with approximately 75%-90% for employee parkers who typically arrive between 7:30 am to 9:00 am and depart between 4:00 pm – 5:30 pm; and about 10%-25% for public parkers arriving and departing throughout the day. When calculating the amount of time the Proposer's system performs, use an assumption of approximately 150-180 vehicles that is moving during these peak periods. Be specific in how many vehicles are staging/queuing in the driveway upon entry and how many are being "parked" or retrieved during peak periods. Explain the staging during mornings and how parkers are to request for their vehicles (e.g., Using an app or request upon arriving garage), what happens when the driver does not reach garage when vehicle is present in retrieval bay. Provide details specific to the proposed design approach for this project.

12.7 Preliminary Schedule and Key Assumptions

Proposers shall provide a preliminary, high-level project schedule illustrating the anticipated sequence and duration of major phases, including design, demolition (if applicable), fabrication, installation, testing, commissioning, and turnover. The schedule shall be accompanied by a narrative describing key assumptions affecting duration and sequencing.

The City recognizes that schedules will be refined following award; however, proposed schedules shall be realistic, internally consistent, and aligned with the Proposer's technical approach.

Provide Master Timeline Schedule indicating estimated number of weeks/months for the different phases (at the minimum) and scenarios:

- Design
- Demo
- Construction
- Commissioning and Testing
- Opening for Public Use

Clearly indicate total downtime period for site.

12.8 Project Team and Key Personnel

Proposers shall identify key personnel proposed for the project, including design leads, construction management staff, installation and commissioning leads, and operations and maintenance leadership. The proposal shall describe each individual's role and relevant experience on comparable fully automated robotic parking systems.

Major subcontractors, technology providers, and system partners shall be identified, along with a description of their roles in project delivery.

12.9 Experience and References

Proposers shall describe their system experience with fully automated robotic parking systems of similar scale and complexity of the City Hall Garage by providing two (2) of the Proposer's closest operating system project profiles. For each referenced project, Proposers shall identify system type, capacity, year of completion, location, percentage of the type of parkers that use these projects, and whether the project involved retrofit or new construction.

The Owner of the parking system is required as references and shall include the name, title, email address, and telephone number who has the most experience with your system.

12.9.1 Video Link of Proposed System

Proposers are requested to provide 1-2 video links to the proposed system to illustrate the functionality, movement, technology of their AVSRS intended to use for the City. This video does not need to be professionally created/produced and can be a simple video captured by personal phone. The purpose of the video is to allow the City and their representatives to better understand the system being proposed.

12.10 Site Visit Opportunities for City Evaluation

Proposers shall identify at least one (in order of priority that best fits WEHO project) operational system comparable to the proposed solution that City can review, if requested. This option should be one of the project profiles submitted in Section 12.9. The proposal shall include the location, general system description, and anticipated ability to facilitate a site visit including interior tour of the garage system and to conduct a site observation, if requested by the City.

12.11 Required Forms and Certifications

Proposers shall complete and submit all required forms identified in the RFP, including compliance checklists, acknowledgments, and requested disclosures. Any exceptions or clarifications related to City-provided sample contractual documents shall be clearly identified.

SECTION 13 – Maintenance and Support

SECTION 13 – MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT

13.1 Operations Support Model

Proposers shall describe in detail its proposed operations support model for the AVSRS following Final Acceptance. The description shall clearly identify how system performance, safety, reliability, and uptime will be monitored and supported throughout the maintenance term.

The Proposer shall explain:

- Whether monitoring is remote, on-site, or hybrid
- The hours of coverage (e.g., 24/7 monitoring vs. defined service hours)
- Fault escalation pathways
- Remote diagnostic capabilities
- Interface with City staff or designated operator
- Procedures for abnormal or degraded system operation

The Proposer shall identify whether support is centralized, regional, or local, and describe how support structure impacts response times and operational continuity.

13.2 Preventative Maintenance Program Description

Proposers shall provide a comprehensive description of its preventative maintenance program specific to the proposed AVSRS solution. The program shall be structured, scheduled, and documented.

The description shall include:

- Frequency of routine inspections and servicing
- Preventative maintenance intervals (monthly, quarterly, annual, etc.)
- Calibration procedures for sensors and control systems
- Inspection and lubrication schedules for mechanical components
- Testing procedures for safety systems and interlocks
- Control system health checks and software integrity reviews
- Environmental or wear-based maintenance triggers

The Proposer shall indicate whether maintenance intervals are fixed or condition-based and describe how system usage data influences maintenance scheduling.

13.3 Corrective Maintenance and Failure Response

Proposers shall describe its corrective maintenance program and failure response methodology. The description shall clearly explain how faults are identified, categorized, escalated, and resolved.

The Proposer shall provide:

- Definitions of fault severity levels
- Target response times by severity level
- Target restoration times
- Escalation hierarchy
- Procedures for isolating faults without unnecessary system-wide shutdown
- Approach to partial service restoration during subsystem failure
- Methods for verifying stability after repair

The Proposer shall explain how recurring faults are analyzed and how systemic corrective measures are implemented to prevent repetition.

13.4 Spare Parts Strategy and Repair Readiness

The Proposer shall describe its spare parts management strategy for both routine wear components and critical system elements.

The description shall include:

- Identification of critical components
- Typical replacement frequency
- Estimated lead times
- Manufacturing origin of critical components
- Availability of local or regional spare inventory
- Strategy for long-lead or specialty parts
- Expected supply chain risks

The Proposer shall indicate whether critical spare parts will be stocked locally, regionally, or internationally, and how downtime risk is mitigated.

This section shall correspond directly with **Form 3 – Parts Criticality Inventory**.

13.5 Maintenance Staffing and Technical Expertise

Proposers shall identify the personnel structure supporting maintenance services. The submission shall include:

- Number of technicians assigned to the project (dedicated vs. shared)
- Certifications and technical qualifications
- Experience with comparable AVSRS systems
- Location of service personnel
- Training protocols for technicians
- Escalation access to engineering support

The Proposer shall identify whether specialized factory technicians are required for certain repairs and how mobilization of such personnel is handled.

13.6 Maintenance Logging, Documentation, and Owner Visibility

Proposers shall maintain a comprehensive electronic maintenance and service log for the AVSRS. All maintenance activities, including preventative, corrective, emergency, and software-related interventions, shall be recorded.

The Proposer shall provide the City with real-time, read-only access to a web-based dashboard or equivalent system displaying:

- System operational status
- Active and historical faults
- Maintenance history
- Service interventions
- Downtime events
- Repair duration
- Software version status

Proposers shall clearly state whether dashboard access is included in the base maintenance pricing or subject to additional fees.

All data generated through system operations and maintenance shall remain accessible to the City throughout the maintenance term.

13.7 Reporting and Performance Monitoring

Proposers shall provide structured periodic reporting to the City. Reporting shall include:

- Summary of preventative maintenance performed
- Summary of corrective maintenance events
- Fault frequency and root cause analysis
- Downtime statistics
- Component replacement history
- Emerging reliability risks
- Recommended lifecycle improvements

Reports shall be analytical in nature and support long-term asset management decisions rather than merely listing completed activities.

13.8 Software Support, Updates, and System Configuration Control

The Proposer shall describe its software maintenance program, including:

- Update frequency
- Cybersecurity patching practices
- Version control procedures
- Change management documentation
- Rollback procedures
- Stability testing prior to deployment

The Proposer shall confirm that the AVSRS software architecture is not designed in a manner that renders the system inoperable in the event of a future change in maintenance provider or ownership. While proprietary source code is not required to be disclosed, the system shall not be dependent on undisclosed, inaccessible controls that prevent qualified third parties from maintaining the system using the documentation and tools provided.

13.9 Relationship to Pricing Form

The Maintenance and Support Proposal shall directly correspond to:

- **Form 2 – Proposer Pricing (Cost #2 – 10-Year Maintenance)**
- **Form 3 – Parts Criticality Inventory**

Proposers shall ensure that the scope described in this Section 13 is consistent with the pricing submitted in Form 2. Any exclusions, assumptions, or limitations affecting maintenance pricing shall be clearly disclosed.

FORMS FOR SUBMITTAL

Proposers must download the following Excel forms and Exhibit A from PlanetBids.

FOR SUBMITTAL: (Return filled in Raw Excel format + PDF copies)

- **(Excel) FORM 1** – Proposers Questionnaire and Checklist
- **(Excel) FORM 2** – Proposers Pricing
- **(Excel) FORM 3** – Proposers Parts Criticality

FOR INFORMATION ONLY:

- **EXHIBIT A** – Existing WEHO Scaled Garage Architectural Plans

APPENDIX

(Terminology & Definitions)

APPENDIX A

ACRONYMS & DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this Request for Proposals (RFP), the following terms shall have the meanings set forth below. These definitions apply throughout the RFP and any associated exhibits unless otherwise stated. In the event of inconsistency between common industry usage and these definitions, the definitions contained herein shall govern.

Core System & Technical Terms

AGV – *Automated Guided Vehicle*; a mobile robotic unit used within the AVSRS to transport vehicles or pallets between entry/exit points and storage locations.

AVSRS – *Automated Vehicle Storage and Retrieval System*; a fully integrated robotic parking system including mechanical, electrical, control, software, and safety components required for automated vehicle parking and retrieval.

Subsystem – A functional grouping of AVSRS components (e.g., lift system, shuttle system, pallet transfer system, control system) that performs a defined role within the overall system.

Degraded Mode – An operational condition in which one or more components or subsystems are unavailable, but the AVSRS continues to operate safely at reduced capacity or throughput.

Abnormal Condition – Any operating condition outside normal automated operation, including faults, alarms, emergency stops, power interruptions, sensor failures, or manual interventions.

Controls, Software, and Safety

PLC – *Programmable Logic Controller*; an industrial digital control device used to automate mechanical and electrical processes, including safety-related and operational logic within the AVSRS.

Safety PLC – A PLC certified for safety-related functions, used to implement emergency stops, interlocks, and fail-safe behavior.

SIL / PL – *Safety Integrity Level (IEC 61508) / Performance Level (ISO 13849-1)*; internationally recognized functional safety classifications defining the required reliability and risk reduction performance of safety-related control systems.

Fail-Safe – A design characteristic in which a system defaults to a safe condition upon loss of power, signal, communication, or control.

Configuration Baseline – The documented, approved combination of software versions, firmware versions, parameters, and settings that define the accepted operational state of the AVSRS.

Testing, Commissioning, and Acceptance

- **FAT** (Factory Acceptance Test) – Structured testing performed at the manufacturer's facility prior to shipment to verify that components or subsystems meet specified functional and safety requirements.

- **SAT** (Site Acceptance Test) – Post-installation testing conducted at the project site to verify that the installed AVSRS operates correctly, safely, and in accordance with approved acceptance criteria.
- **Commissioning** – The structured process of verifying, testing, documenting, and validating that the AVSRS performs as intended across normal, abnormal, and degraded operating conditions.

Reliability Demonstration Period – A defined period of sustained operation used to demonstrate system stability, repeatability, and absence of systemic failures prior to Final Acceptance.

Acceptance – Formal confirmation by the City that contractual requirements for testing, documentation, training, and system performance have been satisfied.

Design, Construction, and Execution Terms

- **Interface** – A physical, functional, or logical connection between system components, disciplines, or external systems (e.g., structural, electrical, fire/life safety, IT, or operations).
 - **Long-Lead Item** – Any component requiring extended procurement or fabrication time that could affect schedule if not planned in advance.
 - **Temporary Works** – Non-permanent structures or systems used during construction or installation (e.g., shoring, bracing, temporary platforms, rigging supports).
-

Gate (or Readiness Gate) – A **formal checkpoint**, not a physical device, used to confirm that defined prerequisites have been completed **before** proceeding to the next phase of work.

A Gate requires:

- Verification that required tasks are complete
- Documentation that prerequisites are satisfied
- Explicit confirmation that proceeding will not introduce avoidable risk

Examples:

- Verifying alignment and wiring **before** energizing equipment
- Confirming safety systems **before** moving vehicles
- Confirming documentation and configuration **before** commissioning

A Gate is **not** an approval delay mechanism.

It exists to prevent rework, damage, unsafe conditions, and commissioning failures.

Service Credit – A **pre-defined contractual remedy** used to address failure to meet specified service or performance obligations (e.g., response times, availability commitments).

Service Credits:

- Are **not penalties**
- Do **not** limit the City's other contractual rights
- Do **not** excuse repeated or systemic failures

- Are typically applied as fee reductions or offsets

Service Credits may be further defined in the Master Agreement and are referenced in the RFP solely to establish transparency of intent.

Recovery Time – The estimated duration required to restore normal or degraded operation following a fault, failure, or emergency condition, assuming reasonable staffing and documented procedures.

Recovery time assumptions are used for:

- Design validation
- Operational planning
- Maintenance readiness

They are **not performance guarantees** unless explicitly stated.

Manual Intervention – Any non-automated action required by trained personnel to stabilize, recover, or reset the AVSRS following an abnormal condition.

Manual intervention shall:

- Be safe
 - Be documented
 - Not require dismantling major system elements
 - Not rely on undocumented or proprietary knowledge
-

Operations, Maintenance, and Owner Visibility

Preventive Maintenance – Scheduled maintenance activities intended to reduce failure risk and extend system life.

Corrective Maintenance – Maintenance activities performed in response to faults, failures, or abnormal conditions.

Maintenance Log – A continuous, auditable record of all maintenance, repairs, interventions, and system changes.

Dashboard – A web-based or electronic interface providing system status, maintenance history, fault logs, and operational metrics.

Read-Only Access – Owner access that allows viewing, exporting, and auditing data without permitting system control or modification.

Ownership, Control, and Future Transfer (Clarifying Only)

Proprietary Lock-In – Any system design, software architecture, licensing structure, or contractual restriction that prevents a qualified third party from operating, maintaining, or supporting the AVSRS following contract expiration or transfer of responsibility.

Open System – A system designed such that control logic, documentation, and interfaces are sufficiently documented to allow continued operation and maintenance by qualified third parties.

Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ)

The governmental or regulatory agency responsible for code enforcement, permitting, inspections, and approvals applicable to the AVSRS and associated facilities.

Configuration Control

The formal process used to document, review, approve, implement, and track changes to hardware, software, firmware, parameters, and system architecture to maintain system stability and traceability.

Cutover

The controlled transition from construction/installation activities to operational use, including the point at which the AVSRS becomes the primary system supporting public operations.

Downtime

Any period during which all or part of the AVSRS is unavailable for normal automated operation, whether planned or unplanned.

Escalation Procedure

A documented process defining how unresolved issues are elevated through technical, managerial, or executive levels to achieve timely resolution.

Final Acceptance

The City's formal confirmation that all contractual requirements for testing, documentation, training, and operational readiness have been satisfied, allowing the system to enter sustained public use.

Interface Register

A controlled document identifying all physical, functional, and logical interfaces, responsible parties, verification status, and resolution milestones.

Operational Readiness

The condition in which the AVSRS, personnel, procedures, documentation, and support resources are prepared for sustained public operation.

Qualified Personnel

Individuals possessing appropriate training, experience, and authorization to perform assigned tasks on automated parking systems or similar electromechanical systems.

Recovery Procedure

A documented sequence of actions used to restore safe and functional operation following a fault, failure, or emergency condition.

Response Time

The elapsed time between notification of an issue and initiation of corrective action by the responsible party.

Substantial Completion

The stage at which the AVSRS is sufficiently complete to permit safe testing, commissioning, and operational simulations, even if minor items remain outstanding.

System Availability

The percentage of time the AVSRS is capable of performing its intended automated functions, excluding approved maintenance periods.

Throughput

The rate at which vehicles can be parked or retrieved over a defined period under specified operating conditions.

Turnover

The formal process of transferring responsibility for operation and maintenance from the Proposer to the City or the City’s designated operator.

Warranty Period

The defined period following acceptance during which the Proposer is responsible for correcting defects in materials, workmanship, or system performance.

Codes and Standards

CBC – *California Building Code*

NFPA 88A – *Standard for Parking Structures*

EVSE – *Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment*, as defined by NEC Article 625

O&M – *Operations and Maintenance*
