

Administrative Updates & Key Dates

Proposal Due Date: October 31, 2025 – no later than 4:00 p.m. (updated)

Addendum #1 (Q&A Clarifications): October 24, 2025 (updated)

Addendum #2 (Pre-Approved Equivalents): ~~October 21, 2025.~~ The pre-approved equivalents originally planned for Addendum #2 are now included in this document. No separate addendum will be issued.

Contract Term: 3 years with two (2) optional one-year renewals **or** 5 years with two (2) optional one-year renewals. (updated) The final term will be confirmed at the time of contract award and reflected in the executed agreement.

Anticipated Contract Start: February 27, 2026 (onboarding and testing to begin in February; go-live targeted for Spring/Summer 2026).

Implementation/Go-Live: Spring/Summer 2026

Public Records & NDA: Proposals may be subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act. The District cannot enter into NDAs for initial submittals.

Context from Presentation (for Reference)

(summarizing the PowerPoint delivered at the RFP Walk)

- **District Overview:** 410,000 accounts, 1.4M customers across Alameda & Contra Costa; 11,000 on Customer Assistance Program; 5% meters on AML.
- **Project Overview:** Current operations in-house; CIS “Customer Watch” system; Quadient Inserter iX9; OMR lines used for mail prep; focus on PDF integrity, security, same-day turnaround.
- **Scope of Work:** Print/mailing of bills, multilingual inserts, tree trim notices; auto-pay customers do not receive return envelopes.
- **Digital Services:** Electronic storage/retrieval, archiving, change orders/art revisions.
- **Specialty Mailings:** Prop 218 notices (time-sensitive), Annual Water Quality Report (~600,000+ pieces, must mail by June 30).
- **Technical & Security Requirements:** HTTPS/SFTP; PGP encryption; PDFs must be processed *as-is*; same-day turnaround required.
- **OMR & Insert Requirements:** Must process OMRs per Intelligent Mailing Systems 1200 G3; no QR codes; inserts must preserve OMR logic; within one-ounce postage.
- **Public Disclosure:** CPRA applies; no NDAs permitted; proposals cannot be marked confidential.

- **Contract Parameters:** 3-year base + two 1-year renewals; postal standards; full-service provider; address validation; business continuity required.
- **Evaluation Criteria:** Technical approach, experience/references, cost, implementation.

Technical & Data Stream Questions

Q1. Can the District replace OMR marks with 2D barcodes (e.g., QR/Datamatrix) for modern inserter compatibility? Can the District provide a companion/metadata file with business rules (insert selection, remit envelope suppression, classifications) instead of relying on OMR?

District Response: The District's current bill and correspondence statements include OMR marks that control inserting logic on the District's existing mail inserter. At this time, the District cannot provide a companion or metadata file containing insert or remittance logic.

Due to the design of the District's Customer Information System (CIS) and current resource constraints, the production process does not support generation of an additional companion data file. The District acknowledges the limitations of OMR-based processing and will evaluate the feasibility of alternative methods, such as 2D barcode implementation or companion data files, as part of future the CIS system replacement effort.

Q2. What is the print data stream? Will balancing/companion control totals be provided (counts, dollar totals, notices, etc.) to reconcile jobs?

District Response: The District's Customer Information System (CIS – Customer Watch) generates print-ready PDF files as the primary print data stream for both bills and customer correspondence. Each batch job (e.g., Batch_Merge_Pdfs and Batch_Print_Customer_Correspondence) produces one or more PDF output files for transmission to the print/mail vendor.

The CIS system also produces companion control totals and reports used for job balancing and reconciliation. These include:

- Batch job completion summaries (e.g., number of statements created, pages, and file names) sent automatically to EBMUD staff via email upon job completion.
- The Daily Postal Detail Report (CW477R2), which summarizes all mailed pieces by ZIP Code, presort scheme, and tray count. This serves as the official control record for daily mail production.

Together, these sources provide the data necessary to verify that:

- All files transmitted from CIS were received and processed by the vendor,
- The number of statements printed and mailed matches CIS totals, and
- Postage and piece counts reconcile to USPS mailing documentation.

The awarded vendor will be expected to generate corresponding mail verification or postal detail reports from their production system to reconcile against the District's control totals. And to coordinate with EBMUD how USPS groups postal schemes. This is to ensure the consistency of the number of statements and the ordering.

Dollar totals and account-level balances are contained within the statement data itself but are not provided as separate control totals for privacy and security reasons.

Q3. Can vendors eliminate preprinted masters (blue/pink shells) and merge District-supplied design files with data to print in a single digital pass?

District Response: Yes. The District can provide blank shell files and black-and-white PDF data for vendor-side digital merge and single-pass printing, pending approval of color accuracy and data integrity.

Q4. Envelope printing: are specifications limited to three PMS spot colors, or may vendors use full color (process) equivalents?

District Response: Please price according to the three PMS color specifications listed. If using four-color process provides equivalent quality and cost efficiency, indicate both options.

Q5. What percentage recycled content is required for envelopes?

District Response: EBMUD does not have a defined minimum percentage. Please specify recycled content, basis weight, and opacity. Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI-certified) materials are acceptable if they meet environmental and quality standards. Include a sample of the glassine window material.

Q6. May vendors commingle mail with other customers to improve postal discounts, or must jobs be presented standalone to USPS?

District Response: Bill statements must use EBMUD's First-Class Presort permit and be presented as standalone mailings. Commingling may be proposed as an option for large special mailings (e.g., Annual Water Quality Report), provided data integrity and USPS reporting remain compliant.

Q7. What delivery reporting is required—USPS Form 3602 only, or Intelligent Mail barcode (IMb) piece-level tracking?

District Response: Vendors shall provide proof of mailing for each job, including the USPS eDoc acceptance receipt or Postage Statement (Form 3600/3602), along with a summary report showing the quantities mailed and the corresponding USPS entry date and time.

Q8. SOC 2 Type 2 report is requested. What qualifies as an equivalent if a vendor cannot share the report without an NDA?

District Response: Vendors may indicate SOC 2 compliance at proposal stage. If shortlisted, the District may execute an NDA to review the report or accept equivalent documentation and/or complete a supplemental questionnaire to be provided by the District's IT Security.

Q9. Clarify the requirement for 'Independent Testing Authority / evidence of qualification testing.'

District Response: The District does not require a separate Independent Testing Authority certification for print or mailing equipment. However, vendors must demonstrate their ability to securely process and print sample data in accordance with the District's specifications prior to award.

Q10. Special mailings: What are the parameters and statutory timelines for the Water Quality Report and Proposition 218 notices?

District Response: Water Quality Report is typically ~6 pages, ~600k pieces, and must be mailed prior to June 30 annually. Proposition 218 notices, ~450K pieces, require 45-day notice prior to the public hearing; Mailing must typically be completed within 30 days of receiving final artwork and mailing list.

Forms, Submittals & Formatting

Q11. Where can vendors find Attachment C (Rates & Charges)? Is it separate from the pricing form table?

District Response: Correction: Attachment C corresponds to the Proposal Form (Exhibit A) pricing tables.

Q12. Which Contract Equity/EEO forms are required at proposal time? Are CP/EEO forms needed if the proposer is not an SBE or DVBE?

District Response: At minimum, submit Form P-025 (Employment Data). A Federal EEO-1 Report may be attached in lieu of completing the table within the Form P-025. Additional forms may be required if subcontractors are included.

Q13. How should proposers format responses to the Scope of Work? Must Exhibits A–K (including samples, holiday schedules) be resubmitted in the proposal package?

District Response: The District will issue formatting guidance indicating where Scope of Work narratives should be placed within the proposal structure and whether Exhibits A–K must be included.

Proposers are not required to complete or return exhibits provided for reference only (e.g., Exhibits G–K, which include artwork samples and holiday schedules). Exhibits A–F are required and must be completed using the District-provided forms without modification.

Q14. Attendance/Sign-in for virtual and in-person participants.

District Response: Microsoft Teams attendance was captured for virtual participants; an in-person sign-in sheet was retained.

Mailing & Postage Evaluation

Q15. How will the District evaluate postage costs in proposals to ensure fairness and avoid low-ball pricing that does not reflect actual USPS rates?

District Response: Postage will be evaluated with standardized assumptions and transparent USPS rates. Artificially low or unrealistic postage will not be used as a basis for award.

Vendor Questions and District Responses

Q16.

Does East Bay MUD have a target date for the project to start and for the services to be live with the new outsourced vendor?

District Response:

Contract start Feb 27, 2026, onboarding/testing Feb 2026; go-live Spring/Summer 2026.

Q17.

Can RFP responses be submitted electronically?

District Response:

Yes. EBMUD will accept electronic submission of proposals as outlined in the RFP instructions. Please respond to max.low@ebmud.com.

Q18.

If RFP responses can be submitted electronically, can the vendor provide a single PDF with all the required information and signed exhibits? Or would East Bay MUD prefer each required exhibit as a individual PDF?

District Response:

A single consolidated PDF is acceptable if all required exhibits and signatures are clearly labeled and included.

Q19.

Can East Bay MUD please provide a separate companion file out of your Customer Watch CIS system which includes the per bill logic to suppress the remittance envelope as well as the marketing inserts the customer account qualifies for. (Based on our discussion during the pre-bid conference, modern inserting technology cannot support OMR marks for quality and integrity purposes)

District Response:

No companion file at this time. Current process relies on embedded OMR. Future 2D options may be evaluated.

Q20.

Please clarify who or what East Bay MUD would accept as qualification statement from an Independent Testing Authority? Would SOC2 compliance and Seamless Mailer Certification be acceptable for the software elements? Could East Bay MUD plan a production site visit to validate the hardware to be used in our proposed solutions?

District Response:

The District does not require a separate Independent Testing Authority certification for print or mailing equipment. However, vendors must demonstrate their ability to securely process and print sample data in accordance with the District's specifications prior to award.

SOC 2 Type II compliance and Seamless Mailer Certification will generally meet qualification requirements for software and operational validation. A production site visit may be coordinated during vendor evaluation or contract negotiation phases. For proposal submittals, vendors may indicate whether they maintain SOC 2 compliance. If shortlisted, the District may execute an NDA to review the SOC 2 report and/or complete a supplemental questionnaire to be provided by the District's IT Security.

Q21.

For high volume mailing (price sheet and Exhibit J), can East Bay MUD please provide specific details for these mailings including:

Please describe the exact mailing requirements for each instance including document type (bills, letters, postcards, newsletters, promotional information, etc.)

- Application type (bill, letter, postcard, direct mail)
- Volumes per job
- Mailing turnaround requirements
- Material specifications to be used
- First class or Standard mailing

Exhibit J appears to have postcards, buck slip inserts (3 ½ x 8 ½) newsletters, annual water reports, marketing and education information. Was this supposed to be examples of the inserts that included in your bills and letters.

For Pricing these items in the Proposal Form "High Volume Mailings" sections, based on your answers to the specifications, do you want an all-inclusive price including printing/producing the items with materials? Or should we add lines to break out printing/production with materials depending on the mailing application type (bills & letters vs Postcards)

District Response:

EBMUD will provide additional specifications in this Addendum #1, including document types, estimated volumes, turnaround expectations, and mail class. Exhibit J was intended as a reference showing typical

insert types that may accompany bills and letters. Mailings are presorted and typically include letters, postcards, pamphlets and high volume mailings. The standard expectation is next-business-day mailing (unless specified) following District approval. Proposers must provide itemized pricing that separates printing and materials by mailing type and should clearly state all pricing assumptions in their proposal. Additional baseline specifications and assumptions are provided in Questions 38–39.

Correction:

Please note that the correct quantity for the **newsletter mailing** is **1,470,000 pieces**, not 245,000 as previously indicated in the RFP.

Q22.

The proposal document mentioned that none of the appendix can be re-typed or otherwise re-created in the proposal. Would it disqualify a vendor if we referenced the appendix with direct quotes so we can address each of the requirements directly?

District Response:

Referencing or quoting text directly from District exhibits or appendices will not disqualify a proposer, provided that the original District forms and exhibits are not altered or reformatted.

Proposers may reference specific sections or requirements within the appendices in their narrative responses for clarity, but all required forms must still be submitted in their original District-provided format without modification.

Q23.

The RFP response packet mentions that Exhibits A-K be included in the submittal. Some of these Exhibits are envelope samples and observed holidays for example. Can you confirm that these need to be submitted with our response even though there is no required action from vendors on some of these documents?

District Response:

Yes. Exhibit G-K can be excluded. All other exhibits must be included with the proposal, even if some require no vendor input. Exhibits without vendor action should be acknowledged as “Reviewed – No Action Required.”

Q24.

Regarding requirement (e), you state: "Proposer shall submit a current SOC 2, Type 2 report (or equivalent) with its proposal." Could you please clarify what would be considered an "equivalent"?

Additionally, is this a mandatory requirement — i.e., would a proposer be disqualified if this documentation is not submitted?

District Response:

At this stage, proposers may state SOC 2 compliance. If shortlisted, EBMUD may require submission of the SOC 2 Type II report under NDA. Equivalent certifications may include ISO 27001 or other third-party audited security frameworks. For proposal submittals, vendors may indicate whether they maintain SOC 2 compliance. If shortlisted, the District may execute an NDA to review the SOC 2 report and/or complete a supplemental questionnaire to be provided by the District's IT Security.

Q25.

Regarding requirement (d), you mention: "Proposer shall submit Attachment C – Rates and Charges, completed in full, as part of its proposal." Could you please clarify if Attachment C is a separate document you can share, or is it the same as the "Proposal Form" that contains the pricing table?

District Response:

No. It is the pricing tables in Exhibit A (Proposal Form).

Q26.

If the Proposer is not an Small Business Enterprise (SBE) nor a Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE), do they still need to complete the CEP and EEO forms?

Could you please clarify which Contract Equity forms proposers are required to complete and submit with their proposals? Should all the forms under Exhibit F be included?

District Response:

All proposers must complete Form P-025 at this stage. Additional Contract Equity documentation will be required from the selected vendor post-award.

Q27.

Regarding the requirement to implement and document the ten Good Faith Outreach Efforts outlined on the District's website, can you please confirm whether all proposers are required to complete and submit documentation of these efforts (i.e., Form P-041) in order to be deemed compliant and considered for award?

District Response:

P-025/EEO-1 is required at submittal.

Q28.

The RFP requests printing the statements in black ink only on color masters. Can we also provide pricing for printing the color and black ink portions on demand all at the same time without masters?

District Response:

Yes. Optional pricing for single-pass color is welcome. Once shortlisted, District will provide shell assets; final approval based on accuracy and quality.

Q29.

The envelope specifications are calling for 3 PMS colors but appear to be four color process. Which way should we price printing them?

District Response:

Please price according to the three PMS color specifications listed. If using four-color process provides equivalent quality and cost efficiency, indicate both options.

Q30.

Will you allow us to add a 2d glyph while maintaining the integrity of the OMR control marks for quality control purposes?

District Response:

Vendors may propose non-intrusive production marks that do not interfere with OMR detection or layout.

Q31.

Does the mail need to be direct presented to the post office with the EBMUD permit #? Can we use our permit number? Can we co-mingle the mail?

District Response:

Bills: standalone First-Class Presort under District's permit. Special mailings may propose commingle as an option.

Q32.

Who currently prints the masters for the statements?

District Response:

RR Donnelley

Q33.

USPS proof of delivery reports are required upon request. Would a 3602 form be what you are looking for? Or, are you looking for tracking information on each piece via the Intelligent Mail Barcode?

District Response:

Vendors shall provide proof of mailing for each job, including the USPS eDoc acceptance receipt or Postage Statement (Form 3600/3602), along with a summary report showing the quantities mailed and the corresponding USPS entry date and time.

Q34.

Can PDF sample output files be provided for review that represent what would be transmitted on an ongoing basis?

District Response:

Yes. Representative samples will be included with Addendum #1 attachments.

Q35.

Would PDF files be accompanied by a companion metadata file? Would PDF files be individual or batch PDFs where multiple PDFs are in a single file?

District Response:

No, there will not be a companion metadata file provided. The District transmits batch PDFs where multiple PDFs are in a single file.

Q36.

Can sample PDFs of the envelopes be provided for review?

District Response:

Included in the RFP.

Q37.

What is the size and preprinting specifications to be applied for the Additional District-Directed Enclosures pricing row? What quantity should be assumed?

District Response:

Assume standard #10 insert specs for pricing. See Exhibit A quantities; final specs per task order.

Q38.

What are the specifications for the High Volume Mailings listed on the Proposal Form Pricing section? Is the assumption of a single duplex black imaged sheet inserted into a #10 the build you would like priced for equal comparison to other proposal responders?

District Response:

High volume mailings include pamphlets, postcards and single duplex black image.

- Letter
 - 8.5x11 stock
 - Up to 50,000 pieces
 - Single duplex black image
 - inserted into a #10 envelope
- Postcards
 - Per request – over 2,000 pieces
 - Size 3 x 5 inches
 - Stock – card stock, white, satin coated finish
 - Ink 4/4
 - Double-sided

- Bi-annual mailing - Approximately 500,000 pieces
 - Size: 10.75 x 5.875 inches
 - Stock: 100# cover, white, velvet or satin coated finish
 - Inks: 4/4, full bleed (+satin AQ)
 - Bindery: trim
- Pamphlet
 - Approximately 500,000 pieces
 - flat size 11" x 25.5" sheet- folded three times (final size 5.5" x8.5")
 - Ink: CMYK 4/4 + overall dull or matte varnish.
 - Stock: Grade #2 (or #3 possible), 70 lb. text-matte coated, white, smooth finish, and minimum 10% recycled content.

Correction:

Please note that the correct quantity for the **newsletter mailing** is **1,470,000 pieces**, not 245,000 as previously indicated in the RFP.

Q39.

On the Proposal Form Pricing section for Outgoing Envelopes, there are three versions, but Exhibit G: Envelope Details and Dimensions shows two preprint versions for Z-072 and Z-073. Do you want pricing to reflect both versions with plate changes included? If yes, can the quantity split for each version be provided?

District Response:

Price to all versions noted in Proposal Form; assume ~800k each unless otherwise stated.

Q40.

If a programming service solution can be provided that interprets and swaps the current OMR barcode methodology with an equivalent 2D barcode and doesn't require any changes to how East Bay Municipal Utility District creates and transmits PDF files, would that be considered? Since we would be providing the archive of the images of record the archive PDFs would show the exchanged 2D barcode for attestation purposes.

District Response:

The District will consider compatible 2D alternatives that do not alter source PDF content or layout. OMR must remain functionally intact.

Q41.

Will EBMUD reconsider the statement made in the pre-bid conference meeting that supplier must agree to work with OMR marks to perform work for EBMUD? OMR marks is no longer a best practice in the industry for Transactional printing as they do not contain a unique mail piece ID data, consume messaging space on the document, and decrease the efficiency to provide variable data.

District Response:

EBMUD recognizes industry trends away from OMR and will evaluate potential alternatives for future implementation. For this procurement, OMR remains required.

Q42.

Will EBMUD reconsider the statement made in the pre-bid conference meeting that EBMUD presently does not intend to move to 2D barcodes? 2D Barcodes have become favored by Transactional print providers because they store significant amounts of data (in a small space) such as, product detail, tracking numbers and unique mail piece Data ID.

District Response:

At this stage, the District will continue using OMR-based files. However, the District is open to evaluating 2D barcode options in future system replacement efforts, pending proof of compatibility.

Q43.

Will EBMUD reconsider the statement that all supplied print ready PDF's must be processed as is, without any minor composition tools being added by the supplier? Transactional print providers add their own marks as and minimal composition to supplied PDF files to ensure the final printed product is high quality print, is accurate, and runs efficiently and smoothly on the supplier's print device. These marks, are essential for correctly aligning and trimming the paper, and calibrating ink density to meet the specific requirements of the print run.

District Response:

Proposers may include minimal composition marks if these do not modify District-provided PDF content or impact document layout integrity.

Q44.

Has EBMUD settled on a date on which the award will be announced to the suppliers.

District Response:

EBMUD anticipates award announcement by February 2026, pending evaluation, contract negotiation and Board approval.

Q45.

Is EBMUD's go live / implementation date of 2/27/2026 flexible to any degree? Even at this date 10/16/2026, that represents a very aggressive timeline.

District Response:

The current target go-live is Spring/Summer 2026 and may be adjusted slightly based on project planning and vendor onboarding.

Q46.

During the Bidder meeting, we determined EBMUD is performing file composition in house, can you please share information on the composition software in use, including the current version number?

District Response:

EBMUD currently uses XSLFast version 4.0.2 for document composition.

Q47.

The Proposer's solution shall be capable of reading and processing District's PDF files containing pre-formatted text, numbers, and OMR marks in accordance with the Intelligent Mailing Systems 1200 G3 OMR specifications. No QR codes are included in the District's files." Will the District allow the vendor to remove the District's OMR marks within the PDF processing function and add our own printing requirements? Can intelligent mailing specifications be provided either as an attachment data file or via XML tagging contained within the PDF? Please confirm whether vendor will be permitted to add our own OMR lines and 2D barcodes per our intelligent mailing needs.

District Response:

Vendors may not modify EBMUD's OMR marks without prior approval. Requests to use alternate intelligent mail barcodes or 2D barcodes will be reviewed for compatibility. No attachment data file will be provided.

Q48.

"Proposer shall be capable of detecting duplicate file transmissions submitted by the District prior to processing. In addition, the system shall provide alerts in the event of a file transmission failure- regardless of the cause – and enable the District to retransmit the file without processing interruption." We do not require our clients to schedule jobs and therefore receive data at any hour. How will the vendor know to anticipate that a file transmission should be coming? We typically only report failures after data is transmitted.

District Response:

EBMUD will provide file transmission schedules and expects vendors to monitor for failures post-transmission rather than anticipated delivery.

Q49.

Envelope requirements in the RFP reference recycled envelopes. Please confirm the percentage of post-consumer recycled content required. Will the District consider envelopes certified by the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) as an alternative to recycled envelopes? SFI envelopes are available at a much lower cost.

District Response:

District Response: EBMUD does not have a set percentage that are required. Please state the amount of recycled material it contains, its basis weight, and its opacity. Also included shall be one sheet of the

glassine (recyclable) material to be used in making the window patch. SFI-certified materials may be considered if they meet environmental and quality standards. SFI-certified materials may be considered if they meet environmental and quality standards.

Q50.

Print, insert, meter, and deliver completed bills and letters to the USPS facility within 24 hours of receiving the District's data file. Please confirm that the intention here is "next business day" mailing, not mailing on weekends.

District Response:

The District requires next-business-day mailing after file receipt; weekend processing is not expected.

Q51.

Use secure, redundant, cloud-based backup systems in geographically separated data centers. Our backup systems are on prem, not cloud based. Can you please confirm whether this requirement is to ensure a backup system is in place, or whether a cloud-based system is a hard requirement?

District Response:

Vendors must maintain secure, redundant backups. Cloud-based solutions are preferred but equivalent on-premises redundancy may be acceptable with documentation.

Q52.

Daily Deliverables request print/mail with next day turnaround, and also requires vendors to process files with same-day turnaround. Can you please clarify turnaround requirements? Please provide approximate file transfer timeline and turnaround expected.

District Response:

Daily deliverables require same-day processing with next-business-day mail entry. File transfers typically occur before 8:00 a.m. Pacific Time.

Q53.

Statement Warning Paper calls for pink paper with microperforation. We are a "white paper" shop, utilizing inkjet printers and printing all documents on demand using white rolls of paper. Is it possible to substitute pink gradient elements in lieu of pink paper for this document type?

District Response:

Vendors may propose use of white stock with pink gradient elements if legibility and microperforation standards are met.

Q54.

We cannot price these mailings without specifics on colors printed per side, and envelope requirements. Typically, high volume mailing requests are quoted at the time of request because volume and

requirements can be so variable. Please provide specifications so that we may price. Additionally, are these one-time jobs or recurring?

District Response:

See Q38/39 baseline specs. Frequency varies by campaign; assume one-time for pricing unless stated.

Q55.

Contract Equity Good-Faith Outreach Efforts. Can you please confirm whether this applies to vendors located outside of the District's geographical region? We are a full-service vendor that utilizes paper mills to source paper and provides the full scope of service in-house. There is very little that is able to be subcontracted in this scope of services. Can you please confirm whether good faith outreach efforts apply.

District Response:

At minimum, submit Form P-025 (Employment Data). A federal EEO-1 Report may be attached in lieu of completing the table within Form P-025. Additional forms may be required if subcontractors are included.

Q56.

Can the District clarify how postage costs will be evaluated to avoid unfairness from differing presort or saturation rate assumptions?

District Response:

The District acknowledges vendor concerns about potential inconsistencies in postage rate assumptions. To ensure fairness and transparency, proposers must clearly specify their postage rate assumptions (e.g., First-Class, presort, saturation). During evaluation, the District will normalize pricing to account for differences in postage methodology and will consider overall value, including contract type, materials, and service quality. Cost is one of several evaluation criteria and will be weighted accordingly.

Evaluation & Contract Parameters (For Reference)

- Evaluation: technical approach; experience & references; cost proposal; implementation plan.
- Contract term: 3 years + two 1-year options or 5 years with two 1-year options
- Onboarding/testing: planned to begin February 2026.
- Anticipated contract start: February 27, 2026.
- Go-live: Spring/Summer 2026.
- Public Records Act: proposals subject to disclosure; no NDAs at initial submittal stage.

RFP – Printing & Mailing Services, No. CUS-0825
Addendum #1 – Working Doc (Questions & Answers)
RFP Walk-Through Summary – October 9, 2025

Closing Note

The District appreciates all vendor participation in this RFP process. These responses are provided for clarification only; any modifications to RFP requirements will be formally issued in a subsequent addendum, if applicable.