



LOXAHATCHEE RIVER DISTRICT

2500 JUPITER PARK DRIVE, JUPITER, FLORIDA 33458

TEL: (561) 747-5700

FAX: (561) 747-9929

D. Albrey Arrington, Ph.D. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

loxahatcheeriver.org

Payment Services RFP #: RFP 26-003-00152

Addendum #2 - Response to Questions Received as of 5 pm September 9, 2026

Posted September 10, 2026 (earlier than scheduled)

1. The RFP states that a bulk transfer of customer payment information from FISGlobal is the responsibility of the vendor, and that preference is given to vendors who facilitate that transfer with no action required by the customer. Has the District received confirmation from Edmunds GovTech and FISGlobal that they will release the stored AutoPay data to the awarded payment provider?

No. Despite efforts to obtain clarification from FIS, the District has not received confirmation regarding the transfer of stored AutoPay payment credentials or related customer payment information to another payment services provider. Proposers should assume that the feasibility of any processor-to-processor migration remains uncertain. If the proposer undertakes a migration, they should describe their proposed approach for credential migration, customer outreach, and transition planning under both migration and non-migration scenarios. The District will give preference to solutions that require no action from the customer for the migration.

2. The District plans to retain Edmunds GovTech MCSJ while replacing its current payment provider. Has Edmunds confirmed that the District may replace the WIPP portal with another vendor, and that Edmunds will support that integration?

The District has informed Edmunds GovTech of this solicitation and the District's desire to evaluate alternative payment services solutions. Based on discussions to date, Edmunds has expressed a willingness to support reasonable integration efforts if the District selects a different payment services provider. However, proposers should independently evaluate and describe any integration requirements, assumptions, dependencies, or costs associated with their proposed solution.

3. Paragraph 28 requires that District funds be held in a segregated trust or for-benefit-of account and not be commingled with the vendor's operating funds. Can the District confirm that this requirement applies only to the separation of District funds from the vendor's own funds?

Correct. The District's intent is that District funds not be commingled with the Contractor's operating funds and not be subject to claims of the Contractor's creditors. This requirement does not prohibit the use of pooled custodial, trust, or for-benefit-of account structures that are commonly used in the payments industry, provided the District's funds remain appropriately segregated from the Contractor's own operating funds. Within any pooled structure, the District's

Kevin L. Baker
CHAIRMAN

Dr. Matt H. Rostock
BOARD MEMBER

Stephen B. Rockoff
BOARD MEMBER

Gordon M. Boggie
BOARD MEMBER

funds must remain separately identifiable and traceable at all times (for example, through sub-account or ledger-level accounting). This response does not modify the risk-of-loss or interest-ownership provisions of Paragraph 28, the no-reserve provision of Paragraph 29, or the sub-merchant/aggregator disclosure requirements of Paragraph 26.

4. Please identify the Districts current payment gateway, merchant acquirer and payment processor and current effective processing costs/fee schedule.

Please see response #4 in Addendum #1.

5. Please provide the channel level transaction breakout including enrolled/AutoPay web, guest web, IVR, counter/POS and any other channels, with transaction count and average ticket by payment method.

The accompanying transaction data file contains the most detailed channel-level data available to the District. Merchant coding is generally as follows: PPFL = sewer bill payments and connection charges; IVRNT = IVR payments; PCFL = miscellaneous payments (including estoppel fees, irrigation quality water payments, and assessment payoffs); WPPOS = in-person point-of-sale/front desk payments. The District does not maintain additional reports that further distinguish guest web transactions from registered portal transactions or AutoPay transactions.

6. Please provide total IVR calls, completed IVR payments and total IVR minutes, and identify whether minutes include balance/due-date inquiries and non-payment activity.

Please see question #5 to access the IVR payment data. We have only recently received IVR minutes - May 2026 was 1,924 min, June 2026 was 517 min, July 2026 was 1,160 min. The District cannot verify whether the reported IVR minutes represent payment transactions only or include non-payment activity such as account inquiries, call transfers, or abandoned calls. Please note that the District offers the IVR service through the phone when the office is closed or all customer service staff are busy, and we publish the number on our website. During office hours our customer service staff typically speak directly with the customers and take their payments over the phone.

7. Please confirm whether card and ACH/eCheck are accepted in both enrolled/AutoPay and guest web services.

Yes – enrolled, autopay and guest payments all accept the same payment methods.

8. Please confirm whether the approximately 14,000 additional ACH transactions have an available average ticket or dollar volume.

The count and volume of the in-house processed ACH transactions for the most recent quarterly billing cycle (August 2026) was 3,347 payments totaling \$435,986, representing an average payment amount of approximately \$130.26. These figures reflect a single quarterly billing cycle and are provided for informational purposes only; they should not be construed as a guaranteed baseline for annual volumes or costs.

9. How many POS devices are required for in-person counter payments?

One device.

10. Does this RFP include Lockbox payments, or is that handled in a separate contract?

The District does not use a bank lockbox remittance service for paper check processing — checks are processed through the District's RemitPlus check-scanning solution (see Addendum #1, Q20).

11. Requirement #6 (page 4) – does the District require split payment capability based on the customer ability to pay for multiple items with multiple methods?

To clarify this item, the District is seeking a solution that allows an owner or property manager to manage multiple properties, each with their own payment method.

12. Desired services – can the District provide more information regarding the ability to guarantee funding on check processing for in-person payments?

The District understands that there are payment solutions that can validate accounts and/or verify funds for check processing of in-person payments and this type of validation would be valuable to the District.

13. Does the vendor need to currently be SOC 2 Type II compliant? If so, is the District expecting copies of the audit with the proposal, or at the time of contract award?

See the response to question 14 below regarding the SOC 2 Type II compliance. Copies of the audit may be requested at the time of contract award as indicated on page 10, item 16.

14. Would the District consider a vendor who was SOC 1 Type II and SOC 2 Type 1 compliant? We are currently pursuing SOC 2 Type II compliance and that audit will be completed by March 2027.

The District will not deem the proposal non-responsive solely on the basis that the Proposer does not yet hold a completed SOC 2 Type II report as of the proposal due date. Proposers in this position must still provide the confirmation required in the Proposal Submittal Instructions & Format section, accurately stating their current SOC 1 and SOC 2 audit status, the scope of system(s) and entities covered by each report, and, for any SOC 2 Type II audit in progress, the anticipated completion date and its basis (e.g., the audit firm's engagement letter or a bridge letter). The District will evaluate the adequacy of a Proposer's current control environment — including any SOC 1 Type II report, SOC 2 Type I report, and PCI DSS Attestation of Compliance as a Level 1 Service Provider already held — as part of Evaluation Factor 2 (Technology, Operational and Security Considerations). If awarded, the Contractor will be required to complete and deliver its SOC 2 Type II report by a firm date established at contract execution, and the District may make timely delivery a condition of Final Acceptance or a milestone subject to the Cure, Suspension and Remedies provision of the General Information & Requirements section. The District reserves the right to request additional information from any Proposer regarding its compliance status before or after the proposal due date.

15. Would the District consider a one-week extension?

No, the proposal due date will not be extended.

*** End of Addendum #2 ***