

RFP 2017-0040 – Telecomm Consultant – Asset Maximization

RFP 2017-0041 Telecomm Consultant – PROW Audit

RFP 2017-0042 Telecomm Consultant – Antenna Aesthetics

Questions and Answers (3 RFPs)

**General Questions for all:**

1. Will the RFP submission deadline be extended?

**Answer: Yes, the deadline is now September 15, 2017.**

2. Can we combine all 3 responses into one document for consideration?

**Answer: Yes. If a participating company would like to combine all three scopes of services they can but they should also break out each scope of service separately in their cost proposal tab to provide a total sum per each scope of services. Additionally the company should provide a combined price of all three scopes of services combined.**

3. Is there a page limit per RFP?

**Answer: No.**

4. Is there a preferred font type and spacing?

**Answer: 12 point font. Otherwise no.**

5. How soon will we receive the Q&As back from staff?

**Answer: Depending upon the volume of questions, we look to have the questions answered and back within one day to a week after the question cut off date.**

6. If we receive the Q&As back from staff less than a week from due date, will there be an extension?

**Answer: If the response period takes more time than usual (reference #4), an extension may be granted by the committee.**

**Telecomm Consultant - Asset Maximization (RFP 040):**

7. Is there a not-to-exceed price for this RFP?

**Answer: The City is not specifying budget amount for the RFP. Participating companies should provide their project approach and breakdown of project tasks with the associated cost per task and any other cost components that may impact these scope of services.**

8. What is the timeline for completion?

**Answer: Participating companies should provide their project approach and breakdown of project tasks with the estimated amount of time per task. Ideally the City expects a 6-8 week project completion once the contract is fully executed but is open to Consultant recommendations with their proposed project approach.**

9. Does the City want every PROW asset evaluated on a “per-line item basis” as part of the proposal?

**Answer: No, just ones owned by the City and of significant value.**

10. Is the “supply training materials” goal to provide the City with a proprietary file/program for future pricing of assets on its own?

**Answer: We are open to generally accepted practices or formulas as well as proprietary systems. The City would like to learn how to do this on their own in the future.**

11. If the City uses our proprietary revenue-generating program, are they willing to pay a license fee for its future use?

**Answer: Reference response to question # 6. Yes, these costs should be provided in the cost proposal section as additional fees with any assumptions listed and provide more detail. The costs will be considered during the evaluation.**

12. Does the City currently have digital mapping information of its assets in .shp or .kmz files that will be supplied as part of the contract award? Or, does the vendor have to gather that data?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

13. Does the City currently have a hierarchy of department approvals in place?

**Answer: The Department of Finance and Department of Public Works currently coordinate these efforts.**

14. Can the best revenue “terms and conditions” be contingent upon future state law PROW regulations?

**Answer: Yes.**

15. Does the City want to construct new city-owned facilities on potential “future sites” identified by the vendor?

**Answer: Maybe. The City expects to evaluate current assets and is open to the idea of evaluations of potential "future sites". Please detail in your RFP proposal.**

16. With respect to RFP 2017-0040, would the City please provide a copy of a sample cell tower lease and a sample antenna lease?

**Answer: Yes, the awarded company will receive one.**

17. With respect to RFP’s 2017-0040, the following are questions related to mapping:

a. Is any of the requested data currently mapped? If so, what is the format of the data?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

b. If not, what is the expected format of all source data that needs to be mapped?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

- c. Is it expected that field data collection (i.e., GPS and attribute collection) will be required for these projects?

Answer: **Reference response to #35 a.**

- d. With respect to the mapping of proposed facilities, is it expected that the consultant will identify these facilities or will they be provided by the City (work orders, other)?

Answer: **Reference response to #35 a.**

- e. What format is necessary for the final mapping deliverable?

Answer: **Reference response to #35 a.**

- f. Will an existing data model be available for use or will one need to be created?

Answer: **Reference response to #35 a.**

- g. Will the deliverable be a GIS with spatially located data? If so, what accuracy level (sub-meter, sub-foot, etc.) is expected?

Answer: **Reference response to #35 a.**

- h. As far as the City knows, will any third party software be necessary?

Answer: **Reference response to #35 a.**

**PROW Audits and Collections (RFP 041):**

18. Is there a not-to-exceed price for this RFP?

**Answer: Reference response to question #6.**

19. What is the timeline for completion?

**Answer: Reference response to question #7.**

20. Does the City have current revenue-generating agreements in the PROW and are they available online for review prior to submission?

**Answer: Yes, but not online. Awardee will have access.**

21. Can the vendor outsource a "CPA audit" as part of the response?

**Answer: Reference response to question #9.**

22. Is the "revenue-generating program" goal to provide the City with a proprietary file/program for future pricing of assets?

**Answer: Maybe.**

23. Will the city provide GIS maps of all city assets?

**Answer: Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

24. If the City uses our proprietary revenue-generating program, are they willing to pay a license fee for its future use?

**Answer: Reference response to question #10.**

25. Does the City currently have digital mapping information of its assets in .shp or .kmz files that will be supplied as part of the contract award? Or, does the vendor have to gather that data?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

26. Can the best revenue “terms and conditions” be contingent upon future state law PROW regulations?

**Answer: Yes.**

27. The City’s RFP references a “PROW User Agreement (that) enables telecommunications providers to install equipment, antennas and towers, etc., in the PROW in exchange for 5% of their gross revenues derived from said use.” Does the City already have a franchise agreement or agreements in place with one or more telecom companies that sets forth the terms of the franchise(s)?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

28. If so, is there a separate agreement in place for landline telecom, wireless telecom (i.e. towers), and/or digital video/cable?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

29. The City’s RFP requests applicants to “Provide a long-term, self-sustaining, revenue-generating program that the City could use.” Does this mean that the City would like the applicant to provide future compliance audits on their behalf to sustain and/or ensure compliance with existing or modified franchise agreements, or does the City desire the applicant to train the City’s staff on such methodologies?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

30. Is the City’s RFP seeking consulting services in regard to their existing PROW User agreements and administration thereof, audit services for compliance with such agreements, or consulting services for modifying, amending, enhancing, or renegotiating PROW agreements and the training of internal staff on such matters?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

31. With respect to RFP 2017-0041, would the City please provide a copy of a sample PROW User Agreement?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

32. With respect to RFP 2017-0041, would the City please advise us at to which companies are currently paying the 5% ROW use fee?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

33. With respect to RFP 2017-0041, does the City wish us to include in the proposal audits of its cable operators?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

34. With respect to RFP 2017-0041, what is the requested “look back” or review period for the audits of PROW User fees?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

35. With respect to RFP’s 2017-0041, the following are questions related to mapping:

a. Is any of the requested data currently mapped? If so, what is the format of the data?

**Answer: Detail could not be obtained to respond to this question. Please detail any assumptions made when providing the RFP proposal in reference to this question. Also list this question in Tab F Exceptions tab for the committee to review further.**

b. If not, what is the expected format of all source data that needs to be mapped?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

c. Is it expected that field data collection (i.e., GPS and attribute collection) will be required for these projects?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

d. With respect to the mapping of proposed facilities, is it expected that the consultant will identify these facilities or will they be provided by the City (work orders, other)?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

e. What format is necessary for the final mapping deliverable?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

f. Will an existing data model be available for use or will one need to be created?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

g. Will the deliverable be a GIS with spatially located data? If so, what accuracy level (sub-meter, sub-foot, etc.) is expected?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

h. As far as the City knows, will any third party software be necessary?

**Answer: Reference response to #35 a.**

**Telecomm Consultant – Antenna Aesthetics (RFP 042):**

36. What is the timeline for completion?

**Answer: One to two months.**

37. What is the minimum number of aesthetic options that the City will consider?

**Answer: Open to recommendations.**

38. Does the “standard spec” creation require engineered drawings?

**Answer: Probably not. More important to understand the tech, various types/limitations, and set dimensional and aesthetic standards.**

39. Can the “fee study” be contingent upon future state law PROW regulations?

**Answer: Yes.**

40. Pg. 5 of the RFP appears to be incomplete, is there a replacement page that will be supplied for review prior to submission?

**Answer: Yes. See below.**

- **Compatibility with current and emerging technology**
- **Evaluation of existing code for consistency with best practices and compatibility with what is proposed in the public rights-of-way.**