



Request for Proposals

(Submitted Questions and Responses)

NC CAMPO Data Management Modernization Study FY 2027

**Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
June 26, 2026**

CAMPO received a significant number of questions and requests for additional information regarding this proposal. These inquiries are grouped below based on similarity and relation to components of the RFP (technical questions, data and deliverables requests, proposal clarifications, and contract revisions). CAMPO staff made every attempt to answer these inquiries in a timely fashion.

Technical Questions

1. Does CAMPO currently maintain licenses for business intelligence, reporting, or dashboard platforms (e.g., Power BI, Tableau, etc.) that should be considered/leveraged as part of this effort? Or should we assume any required reporting and dashboarding capabilities will be provided within the proposed solution?

Answer:

CAMPO has access to a suite of Microsoft reporting platforms via our agreement with the town of Cary. While there is a strong preference for the proposed solution to operate outside of the Cary IT ecosystem, if significant cost-savings are gained by leveraging those resources CAMPO is open to exploring that approach.

2. Has CAMPO formally documented the relationships, dependencies, and business rules between TIP, LAPP, MTP/CTP, and Wake Transit data, or is discovery and validation of those relationships expected as part of this effort?

Answer:

CAMPO has not formally documented the items outlined above, an informal process has been conducted but proposers should presume discovery and validation will be expected as part of this effort. CAMPO is also open to any proposed optimization of existing relationships, dependencies, and business rules.

3. Approximately how many active users currently access each program area, and are there anticipated future user growth targets that should be considered in system design?

Answer:

Current active users (internal): MTP/CTP – 20, TIP/STIP – 20, Wake Transit – 4, LAPP – 5

Future growth target (internal): MTP/CTP – 25, TIP/STIP – 25, Wake Transit – 20, LAPP – 20

Future growth target (external – guest accounts): MTP/CTP – 50, TIP/STIP – 50, Wake Transit – 10, LAPP – 20

4. What existing enterprise technology platforms and cloud computing environments CAMPO have access to (Databricks, Snowflake, AWS, etc.)?

Answer:

CAMPO has access to Azure cloud computing environment via IT agreement with Town of Cary. CAMPO prefers to stay outside of Cary's IT ecosystem but is open to proposals if significant cost savings are gained by leveraging those resources.

5. What is CAMPO's preferred hosting/deployment environment (e.g., vendor SaaS, proposer-hosted cloud, client-hosted environment)?

Answer:

CAMPO prefers either vendor SaaS or proposer-hosted cloud environments but is open to client-hosted proposals if significant cost savings are gained by leveraging internal resources.

6. What level of data cleaning and validation does CAMPO expect as part of the migration effort? Are we looking to migrate all records, active records, historical archives, etc.

Answer:

Yes, a complete data cleaning and validation process is anticipated for all active records. Historical records for MTP/CTP and TIP from two prior development cycles, respectively, are expected to be included in migration.

7. What historical tracking must be preserved?

Answer:

Approved project revisions and field-level audit logs (for capturing minor modifications to projects), formal amendments to all four programs outlined in this proposal, prior MTP/CTP and STIP/LAPP deliverables from two previous programming cycles.

8. Has NCDOT approved API Access for their TIP cloud solution?

Answer:

NCDOT's STIP Manager implementation does not currently expose a formal external API. However, PMG (STIP Manager vendor) has successfully implemented external, REST-based APIs for other STIP deployments. It is anticipated that NCDOT will prioritize this as a potential future enhancement of the application. Additionally, NCDOT is evaluating cloud migration of the system to a GovRamp certified PMG hosted environment, which will provide a more flexible foundation for future API integration.

Furthermore, current integration efforts of STIP Manager have been managed internally by NC's GIS team. External access to STIP Manager will be initially limited in scope (read-only and select write-back functions) and will require NCDOT-managed credentials. Further details can be furnished to selected vendor for this project.

CAMPO and NCDOT generally agree that any future external integration efforts be bidirectional in nature. Given the above, the scope of this RFP has been revised to reflect this requirement as part of a

deferred deliverable or future enhancement pending further scheduling refinements from NCDOT and PMG.

9. What, if any, detail should be included around post-implementation/SLA support in the proposal response?

Answer:

At a minimum - a direct contact/phone number to call in emergencies, an email or ticketing-based reporting system for all other technical/support issues, and an online resource guide. Beyond that, vendors are to use their best judgement based on experience in deploying similar solutions.

10. The desired timeline mentions the solution will be furnished by July 1, 2027, but does CAMPO envision a single go-live or phased deployment by module?

Answer:

Yes, a phased deployment, loosely aligned with individual program activity cycles/turnover/major deliverables is envisioned.

11. What authentication requirements apply (e.g., SSO, MFA, password standards, guest accounts, and external user access controls)?

Answer:

CAMPO prefers MFA and requires industry standard password protocols, guest accounts, and variable external user access controls. SSO is preferred if proposed solution is geared towards operating within town of Cary IT environment.

12. NCDOT TIP integration. Does NCDOT's cloud-based TIP system expose a documented API today? If so, can CAMPO facilitate access to its API documentation, an NCDOT integration contact, and a non-production/test endpoint? Additionally, is the data exchange expected to be read-only, write-back, or bidirectional?

Answer:

NCDOT's STIP Manager implementation does not currently expose a formal external API. However, PMG (STIP Manager vendor) has successfully implemented external, REST-based APIs for other STIP deployments. It is anticipated that NCDOT will prioritize this as a potential future enhancement of the application. Additionally, NCDOT is evaluating cloud migration of the system to a GovRamp certified PMG hosted environment, which will provide a more flexible foundation for future API integration.

Furthermore, current integration efforts of STIP Manager have been managed internally by NC's GIS team. External access to STIP Manager will be initially limited in scope (read-only and select write-back functions) and will require NCDOT-managed credentials. Further details can be furnished to selected vendor for this project.

CAMPO and NCDOT generally agree that any future external integration efforts be bidirectional in nature. Given the above, the scope of this RFP has been revised to reflect this requirement as part of a deferred deliverable or future enhancement pending further scheduling refinements from NCDOT and PMG.

13. How many users will require access to the system and training?

Answer:

Five power users per program/module, 15 basic users.

14. Is documentation available for NCDOT's cloud-based TIP system, and exactly what data will need to be exchanged? Interoperability requires some NCDOT involvement. Has CAMPO already negotiated this (or will it) or will that need to be done as part of the project?

Answer:

NCDOT's STIP Manager implementation does not currently expose a formal external API. However, PMG (STIP Manager vendor) has successfully implemented external, REST-based APIs for other STIP deployments. It is anticipated that NCDOT will prioritize this as a potential future enhancement of the application. Additionally, NCDOT is evaluating cloud migration of the system to a GovRamp certified PMG hosted environment, which will provide a more flexible foundation for future API integration.

Furthermore, current integration efforts of STIP Manager have been managed internally by NC's GIS team. External access to STIP Manager will be initially limited in scope (read-only and select write-back functions) and will require NCDOT-managed credentials. Further details can be furnished to selected vendor for this project.

CAMPO and NCDOT generally agree that any future external integration efforts be bidirectional in nature. Given the above, the scope of this RFP has been revised to reflect this requirement as part of a deferred deliverable or future enhancement pending further scheduling refinements from NCDOT and PMG.

15. Does CAMPO expect the vendor to bundle cloud hosting and infrastructure costs (e.g., AWS, Azure) within the Annual Maintenance and Support phase pricing?

Answer:

For ongoing operation of these components, yes. Costs for any initial setup associated with these components should be priced into development phase pricing.

16. Will CAMPO or the Town of Cary provide and pay for the cloud environment directly under an existing enterprise cloud agreement?

Answer:

This is hypothetically possible however details of proposed solution and town buy-in are required first.

17. For the required integration with NCDOT's cloud-based TIP system, are the authenticated APIs and field mappings already fully documented and available to the selected vendor, or should we factor technical discovery and custom middleware development into our implementation costs?

Answer:

NCDOT's STIP Manager implementation does not currently expose a formal external API. However, PMG (STIP Manager vendor) has successfully implemented external, REST-based APIs for other STIP deployments. It is anticipated that NCDOT will prioritize this as a potential future enhancement of the application. Additionally, NCDOT is evaluating cloud migration of the system to a GovRamp certified PMG hosted environment, which will provide a more flexible foundation for future API integration.

Furthermore, current integration efforts of STIP Manager have been managed internally by NC's GIS team. External access to STIP Manager will be initially limited in scope (read-only and select write-back functions) and will require NCDOT-managed credentials. Further details can be furnished to selected vendor for this project.

CAMPO and NCDOT generally agree that any future external integration efforts be bidirectional in nature. Given the above, the scope of this RFP has been revised to reflect this requirement as part of a deferred deliverable or future enhancement pending further scheduling refinements from NCDOT and PMG.

18. Approximately how many external users, consultants, or partner agencies will require access?

Answer:

Public will need general read access to reports and other outputs. Proposed solutions with public dashboards/interfaces are welcome but basic PDF publication for routine posting to CAMPO website is sufficient. An estimate of 5-10 partner agencies will require at least temporary access in any given year. 2-4 partner agencies requiring permanent access.

19. Does CAMPO require role-based access control down to specific projects, programs, or fields?

Answer:

Yes, to all of the above.

20. Is single sign-on (SSO) required? If so, what identity provider is currently used (Microsoft Entra ID/Azure AD, Okta, etc.)?

Answer:

SSO is required only if proposed solution is to be hosted on client-side. CAMPO/town of Cary currently uses Okta for SSO.

21. How many concurrent users must the future solution support?

Answer:

25-30 at a minimum, no more than 50 max (including external and internal users).

22. Does CAMPO have a preferred hosting model (cloud, SaaS, hybrid, or on-premises)?

Answer:

While there is a preference for the proposed solution to operate in a cloud or SaaS environment outside of the Cary IT ecosystem, if significant cost-savings are gained by leveraging on-prem/internally available resources CAMPO is open to exploring that approach

23. Are there organizational standards or restrictions regarding cloud providers (Microsoft Azure, AWS, Google Cloud)?

Answer:

For proposer-hosted solutions, CAMPO will be reliant on vendor suggested standards and restrictions. For proposed client-hosted solutions, town of Cary IT policy will dictate standards and restrictions and will serve as technical adviser to the MPO on these matters.

24. Is the Town of Cary IT department providing hosting infrastructure, or is CAMPO expecting the proposer to provide hosting recommendations?

Answer:

Preference is for proposer-hosted infrastructure, but CAMPO is interested in internal hosted-infrastructure if cost-savings are significant.

25. Beyond NCDOT's TIP system, what other external systems require integration?

Answer:

None, currently, but any proposed solution should be capable of expanding to meet future integration efforts with similar architecture.

26. Is CAMPO open to incorporating AI-enabled capabilities as part of the modernization effort?

Answer:

Yes.

27. Does the NCDOT STIP tool have a public, documented API available? (2.1 Introduction)

Answer:

NCDOT's STIP Manager implementation does not currently expose a formal external API. However, PMG (STIP Manager vendor) has successfully implemented external, REST-based APIs for other STIP deployments. It is anticipated that NCDOT will prioritize this as a potential future enhancement of the application. Additionally, NCDOT is evaluating cloud migration of the system to a GovRamp certified PMG hosted environment, which will provide a more flexible foundation for future API integration.

Furthermore, current integration efforts of STIP Manager have been managed internally by NC's GIS team. External access to STIP Manager will be initially limited in scope (read-only and select write-back functions) and will require NCDOT-managed credentials. Further details can be furnished to selected vendor for this project.

CAMPO and NCDOT generally agree that any future external integration efforts be bidirectional in nature. Given the above, the scope of this RFP has been revised to reflect this requirement as part of a deferred deliverable or future enhancement pending further scheduling refinements from NCDOT and PMG.

28. *Maintain MTP project inventory and recommendations, including new project entry and modification, lifecycle tracking and advanced project development tasks (batch attribute updates, sequential project tagging, parent-child project splits, replication, and rollbacks).* Could you clarify what you mean by "rollback" in this context? Are you referring to: Reverting a project to an earlier workflow status (e.g., moving from "Pending Review" back to "Draft"); or Restoring a previous version or revision of a project after changes have been made? Understanding which scenario you mean will help us determine the best way to support this requirement. (2.1 Objective iv. a)

Answer:

Both, but specifically the latter scenario. It is a feature we currently lack and would find useful given fluid nature of project revisions.

29. *c. Maintains data relationship with CAMPOs Roadway Prioritization and Fiscal Constraint tools.* Can you provide more detail on what is intended here? Can you provide more detail on the expected relationship with these tools? Is this requirement simply to store and track an ID, import/export, or a live API? If the latter, could you provide sample data files or formats for these tools? (2.1 Objective iv. c)

Answer:

These tools currently utilize either a static import or live DBE connection for accessing relevant records from our MTP/CTP database. The intended objective of this component is to, at a minimum, preserve this relationship. Enhancement of data flow between these tools and the proposed solution is most certainly welcome.

30. *e. External Intake – Method B: Enable CAMPO to export a structured Excel/CSV template (schema) that external parties populate for direct import by CAMPO staff, with validation and error handling. Is this a different/separate import format than Survey123? Are there multiple project import formats that would need to be supported? (2.1 Objective iv. e.)*

Answer:

This is a separate import process from Survey123 (LAPP program). This is specifically for MTP/CTP program. CAMPO often hires consultants to perform sub-regional studies that supplement the currently adopted MTP and serve as a feeder for future recommendations in the next round of MTP/CTP development. Batch import of these recommendations is required as CAMPO retains all records before ultimately deciding which improvements progress into formal MTP (roadway, transit, bike/ped projects).

Current Data and Deliverables Requests

1. How many Microsoft (MS) Access databases currently exist, and which programs do they support (TIP, LAPP, MTP/CTP, Wake Transit)? Approximately how many records are within each database?

Answer:

Five databases in total, 1 for MTP/CTP, 2 for TIP, 1 for Wake Transit, 1 for LAPP. MTP/CTP ~2,000 records, current TIP ~700 records, LAPP ~250 records, Wake Transit ~600 records.

2. Can CAMPO provide examples of existing reports, report templates, or recurring reporting outputs that should be replicated, enhanced, or supported within the configurable reporting capabilities described in the RFP?

Answer:

Yes, see attached documentation with this response package.

3. Is there any formal documentation that exists for the existing MS Access files?

Answer:

For some (MTP/CTP/Wake Transit) we have internally sourced SOPs/user guiders and some light documentation / metadata within the DBs. Automated routines/scripts are generally lightly documented.

4. Can CAMPO provide data dictionaries and schema documentation for each existing database?

Answer:

Yes, see attached documentation with this response package.

5. Can CAMPO provide the workflow diagrams, business-rule documentation, process maps, and data relationship assessments developed during the previous modernization effort?

Answer:

A basic diagram of entities and relationships described in this RFP has been sourced internally and is provided as part of this response package. Business-rule documentation, process maps, and data relationship assessments will need to be performed as part of this study.

6. Database access (for migration scoping). Can proposers be granted read access to the current Access databases, or to copies, schema exports, and representative data extracts, so that the migration effort can be scoped and priced accurately? If access cannot be provided before award, at what point in the process would it be provided?

Answer:

Database schemas and templates are included as part of this response package. Full access will be provided to selected vendor once project begins.

7. The RFP notes that the current legacy ecosystem consists of five distinct Microsoft Access databases supporting approximately 20 users. To help us accurately scope the Initial System Setup and Handoff phase, could you provide the approximate file sizes, total table counts, or any available documentation regarding the existing schemas?

Answer:

Total database file sizes are ~300MB, excluding attachments/supporting materials. A detailed summary for each database containing object and row counts is included as part of this response package.

8. Can CAMPO provide a list of all existing databases, their purpose, owners, and approximate size?

Answer:

Five databases in total, 1 for MTP/CTP (GIS Team), 2 for TIP (GIS/Planning Teams), 1 for Wake Transit (Wake Transit Team), 1 for LAPP (Planning Team).

9. What is the current total data volume (GB/TB) across all Access databases?

Answer:

~4GB, including associated attachments (~300MB for DBs, remaining volume are primarily image files)

10. Are any databases linked together today through Access relationships, linked tables, VBA scripts, or manual processes?

Answer:

Yes (all of the above).

11. What custom forms, macros, VBA code, reports, or workflows currently exist within the Access environment?

Answer:

See attached schema documentation in this response package.

12. Are there any third-party applications or tools that directly interact with the Access databases?

Answer:

No, primary data flows are from the Access databases to other utilities/applications. See attached diagram for more information.

13. Which databases are considered mission-critical versus archival/reference systems?

Answer:

All five databases are considered mission critical.

14. Are there any known data quality issues, duplicate records, or inconsistent data definitions across programs?

Answer:

Outdated secondary or tertiary attribute data is common in the current MTP/CTP database; STIP, LAPP, and TIP less so. Checks for duplicate records and inconsistent data definitions should be planned as part of this process.

15. Please provide a breakdown of users by program area (TIP, LAPP, MTP, Wake Transit, Administration, Consultants, etc.).

Answer:

Current active users (internal): MTP/CTP – 20, TIP/STIP – 20, Wake Transit – 4, LAPP – 5

Future growth target (internal): MTP/CTP – 25, TIP/STIP – 25, Wake Transit – 20, LAPP – 20

Future growth target (external – guest accounts): MTP/CTP – 50, TIP/STIP – 50, Wake Transit – 10, LAPP – 20

For internal users: Approximately, 3 admins for entire solution, 5 power users per program/module, 15 basic users per program/module.

16. What user roles and permission levels exist today?

Answer:

None, but select databases are configured as switchboards (front end on client side, back end on shared network drive) with limited navigation options to reduce inadvertent data access.

17. Can CAMPO provide a current-state architecture diagram showing databases, interfaces, users, and external systems?

Answer:

Yes, see attached basic diagram included in this response package.

18. Where are the existing Access databases hosted (local desktops, shared drives, network servers, virtual servers, cloud storage)?

Answer:

Split databases: Back-end - Shared network drives. Front-end – local machines.

Single file/integrated databases – Shared network drives.

19. What server infrastructure currently supports the application environment?

Answer:

See response to questions 16 and 18 within this section of questions.

20. How is data currently collected for TIP, LAPP, MTP, and Wake Transit programs?

Answer:

TIP Program: 80% of TIP information is imported from NCDOT STIP reports. 20% created manually by CAMPO Staff (LAPP & WT)

LAPP: Information is collected primarily from project submissions via Survey123 platform. Additional information is generated internally for each project for reporting and evaluation purposes.

MTP/CTP: Information is collected via sub-regional studies and local plans through a variety of methods but primarily batch excel/access/GIS deliverables or individual electronic or personal communications.

Wake Transit: Manually collected from partner transit agencies, or from MTP/CTP recommendations, and entered into DB.

21. Are there existing data dictionaries, metadata repositories, or schema documentation available?

Answer:

Yes, see attached Access object/schema reports as part of this response package.

22. What reporting tools are currently being used (Access Reports, Excel, Power BI, Tableau, ArcGIS Dashboards, etc.)?

Answer:

Access reports (MTP/CTP, Wake Transit), excel (TIP, LAPP, MTP/CTP, Wake Transit), and ArcGIS applications (all programs).

23. *Provide configurable reports for program oversight and audit readiness. Please provide examples of current or desired reports generated by the new platform. (2.1 Objective iii. b)*

Answer:

Examples include: Current TIP, TIP Amendments, MTP Project lists by Horizon Year, LAPP project lists, LAPP programmed amounts vs obligated amounts. See attached sample reports in this response package.

24. *Support recurring batch project entry using outputs from current project submission process and platform (survey 123). Can you provide an example file? (2.1 Objective iii. c)*

Answer:

See attached sample reports in this response package.

Proposal Clarifications

1. Is there a maximum number of pages for the proposal response? Or a page limit per section?

Answer:

While no page limit is specified, we expect responses to be as concise as possible while providing all requested information.

2. What is the estimated budget for this initiative (year 1 and beyond)?

Answer:

Year 1 (FY27) budget is \$100,000, future funding is dependent on selected vendor and proposed solution.

3. For the cost estimate, how much detail is expected?

Answer:

A breakdown of costs by listed deliverables in section 2.3 of this RFP is expected. In addition, please include any additional estimated costs for general project management, ongoing maintenance/support, any proposed future enhancements, and any miscellaneous items not mentioned explicitly in this

response but inherent for project completion.

4. Budget range. Does CAMPO have a target budget or not-to-exceed range for (a) the initial build and handoff, and (b) annual maintenance and support? This will help us right-size the proposed solution to CAMPO's expectations.

Answer:

Year 1 (FY27) budget is \$100,000, future funding is dependent on selected vendor and proposed solution.

5. How many years of licensing should we provide in our cost proposal?

Answer:

3 years.

6. Is there an incumbent for this contract? If so, please provide the incumbent's name, current contract number, duration, historical level of effort, and value of the contract.

Answer:

There is no incumbent.

7. We request that you provide a two-week extension to the response due date. This will allow us to create a compelling technical response.

Answer:

CAMPO will proceed with the schedule published in the RFQ.

8. Can the work be performed remotely?

Answer:

Yes, excluding stipulated in-person training sessions.

9. Can the part work be performed outside the USA (e.g., India)?

Answer:

Please refer to **E-Verify** clause in attached contract template regarding work performed outside USA: *Contractor shall comply with E-Verify, the federal E-Verify program operated by the United States Department of Homeland Security and other federal agencies, or any successor or equivalent program used to verify the work authorization of newly hired employees pursuant to federal law and as in accordance with N.C.G.S. §64-25 et seq. In addition, to the best of Contractor's knowledge, any subcontractor employed by Contractor as a part of this contract shall be in compliance with the requirements of E-Verify and N.C.G.S. §64-25 et seq.*

10. Can the vendor provide pricing in their own format in MS Excel?

Answer:

Yes.

11. Does "furnished by July 1, 2027" mean that the replacement solution must be fully developed, tested, and accepted by that date?

Answer:

Yes, if vendors have concerns please outline them in proposals.

12. Please confirm whether the vendor response should include; A detailed approach and cost breakdown for each item listed under Section 2.1 - Objectives (a–e) and/or; Section 2.3 Deliverables (a–g); or Providing hourly rates for the proposed project resources is sufficient for this proposal.

Answer:

A breakdown of costs by listed deliverables in section 2.3 of this RFP is expected. In addition, please include any additional estimated costs for general project management, ongoing maintenance/support, any proposed future enhancements, and any miscellaneous items not mentioned explicitly in this response but inherent for project completion.

13. Section 2.1 (d)(ii) specifies both recorded virtual and in-person training. To ensure consistent pricing among proposers, how many distinct in-person training sessions or travel days should be factored into the technical and cost proposal?

Answer:

Two in-person sessions at a minimum. Beyond that, vendors are advised to use best judgement based on past experiences deploying similar solutions.

Contract Revisions

Note – General response to all questions in this category. Specific responses are provided where deemed appropriate: CAMPO will negotiate a contract, including any desired amendments to our standard template,

with a selected vendor based on advice from our attorney. We cannot commit to any contract template amendments at this stage in the process.

1. If a bidder requires exceptions to any terms, would you like them included in the proposal or to negotiate them at a later point?

Answer:

Yes, please include them in a distinct portion of the proposal.

2. During our review of the draft agreement, we developed a few suggested revisions and would welcome CAMPO's feedback on whether these clarifications may be considered. (see screenshot of revisions below – TGS)

- Upon any contract award, Proposer requests the following modifications to Section 2 of the CAMPO's agreement. The requested revisions clarify that time-based obligations are applied in a manner consistent with the Consultant's professional standard of care, rather than as an absolute, strict liability standard, and remove the optional liquidated damages provision, which imposes a fixed penalty not aligned with the nature of professional services. Together, these changes better reflect industry practice by tying performance and any potential liability to the applicable standard of care, while avoiding predetermined damages that are not representative of actual loss and are generally not insurable under professional liability coverage.

2. Time of Performance In performing the services described in this Contract, it is mutually agreed that time is of the essence to the extent consistent with the applicable professional standard of care. The Contractor shall begin work without delay following execution of this Contract by both parties, and upon CAMPO's giving to the Contractor Notice to Proceed with the work. The work shall be completed as follows: (This can be "on or by" a fixed date, or by setting out project milestones with fixed dates for completion of each.) The term of this Agreement shall commence upon execution by all parties and shall continue through the Contractor's satisfactory completion of all work, services, and tasks described in the Contract.

Optional: In the event the services under the Contract are not completed by the above-stated completion date, the Contractor shall be assessed liquidated damages of ____ for each day's delay beyond the completion date. The parties acknowledge that a determination of actual damages resulting from each day's delay would be problematical, and the above-stated liquidated damage sum is mutually agreed to be a fair and reasonable compensation sum for delay in final performance.

- No professional liability policy will allow additional insured status. Proposer requests the following modifications to Section 7 of CAMPO's agreement upon any contract award.

7. Insurance

Additional Insured – Contractor agrees to endorse CAMPO and the Town of Cary as additional insureds on the Commercial General Liability, and Auto Liability, and Professional Liability policies. The endorsement shall read: "Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Town of Cary are named additional insured as their interest may appear."

- Upon any contract award, Proposer requests the following modifications to Section 8(A)(1) of CAMPO'S agreement. The requested revisions remove the standalone duty to defend in order to align the provision with North Carolina law (N.C. Gen. Stat. § 22B-1), which limits defense obligations in design professional agreements and renders impermissible any requirement to provide an upfront or independent defense. The revised language preserves the Owner's ability to recover reasonable defense costs to the extent caused by Contractor's fault, while ensuring the obligation is structured as part of indemnity rather than as a separate, immediate duty to defend.

8. Indemnity

A. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTOR'S INDEMNIFICATION (EXCLUSIVE OF DESIGN SERVICES) TO CAMPO

1. To the fullest extent allowed by law, the Contractor shall defend; indemnify and hold harmless (including reimbursement of reasonable defense costs to the extent provided herein) CAMPO, its officers, officials, employees, agents, or indemnittees (collectively called "Indemnified Parties") from and against those Losses, liabilities, damages, and costs caused by, arising out of, resulting from, or in connection with the execution of the work provided for in this Agreement, when the Fault of the Contractor or its Derivative Parties is a proximate cause of the Loss, liability, damage, or expense indemnified.

3. The Contract for Professional Services template contains an optional placeholder for Liquidated Damages regarding schedule delays. Will CAMPO be enforcing liquidated damages for this specific project? If yes, what is the anticipated daily assessment rate?