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ADDENDUM #1
PDC-RFP-2020-01

This document, Addendum #1, is issued to provide the following information:
1. Updates to the schedule of events and specific proposal instructions;
2. Responses to procurement-related questions; and

The forthcoming Addendum #2 will provide responses to technical questions on the scope of work (PDC-RFP-2020-01, Attachment 2) and extend the deadline for proposal submissions. Please monitor the following websites for updated information: (http://www.hrpdcva.gov/page/procurement and https://www.hrtpo.org/page/procurement/).

I. Updates to the Schedule of Events and Specific Proposal Instructions

PDC-RFP-2020-01, Section IV. Schedule of Events (page 5):

The schedule of events on page 5 of the RFP is updated as follows to add the forthcoming publication of Addendum #2 and extend the proposal submission deadline beyond January 14, 2020 (new dates are to be determined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Old Date</th>
<th>New Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publish RFP Addendum #2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Proposals</td>
<td>01/14/2020</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PDC-RFP-2020-01, Section VII. Specific Proposal Instructions, Subsection B.6. (page 7):

Section VII., Subsection B. 6. (page 7) RFP is updated as follows (additions are in red underlined text; deletions are [bracketed strike-through] text):

6. A description of staff and other resources, including subconsultants, which will be assigned to this contract. Include those individuals with [to include] years of experience with similar successful contracts comparable to the requirements contained in this solicitation and years with the Offeror.
II. **Procurement-Related Questions and Responses**

1. Will each offeror be able to bid both engineering and construction for the project?

2. Can the alternative concepts stated in the RFP include full turnkey design/build project management and operation of the RCR?

3. Please clarify alternative concepts.

   **Response to questions 1, 2, and 3:**
   Alternative bids will be considered. The Southside Network Authority is interested in innovative approaches that advance the project in a timely and efficient manner.

4. If the Offeror, a SWaM certified contractor, intends to complete 100% of the work outlined, does the offeror fulfill the DBE/Swam 10% requirement?

   **Response:**
   Yes.

5. Will non-DBE companies performing all services in-house with no subcontractors be considered since DBE requirements would not be met? Will companies that are not DBE certified and do not meet the DBE requirements be considered?

   **Response:**
   Non-DBE offerors will be considered. However, we encourage the participation of DBE and SWaM firms in this project.

6. Page 10 Item A: 10% of the evaluation is based on “DBE/SWaM Participation.” On this page and p.13 it is stated that a 10% DBE participation goal has been established. Will the use of SWaMs (who are not necessarily DBE) be considered towards that 10% goal? Or will it strictly be based on DBEs?

   **Response:**
   SWaMs will be considered toward the 10% goal.

7. Page 7 item E.: Please confirm that proprietary information should reference Form 8, not Form 9.

   **Response:**
   Yes, proprietary information should reference Form 8. PDC-RFP-2020-01, Section VI. Proposal Preparation and Instructions, Subsection E. (page 7) is updated as follows (additions are in red underlined text; deletions are [bracketed strike-through] text):
E. Each copy of the proposal should be bound or contained in a single volume where practical. All documentation submitted with the proposal should be contained in this single volume, with the exception of proprietary information (see Form 8[9]).

8. Page 9 Trade Secrets: Please confirm that proprietary information should reference Form 8, not Form 9 and that Form 9 “References”, can be included with proprietary information.

Response:
Yes, proprietary information should reference Form 8. The last paragraph of PDC-RFP-2020-01, Section IX. Submittal Process and Information (page 9) is updated as follows (additions are in red underlined text; deletions are [bracketed strike-through] text):

Trade secrets or proprietary information must be submitted in a separate package by an Offeror in response to this Request for Proposal and shall not be subject to public disclosure under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; however, the Offeror must invoke the protection of this section prior to or upon submission of data or materials, and must identify the data or other materials to be protected and state the reasons why protection is necessary (§2.2-4342F of the Code of Virginia). NOTE: The entire proposal CANNOT be considered proprietary. Please reference Form 8[9] when replying to this section.

9. Page 19: 49 CFR Part 26... Form 6. Should these forms be included in our printed/PDF proposals? Or emailed/faxed as indicated at the bottom of the form?

Response:
All required forms must be included in both the hard copies and the electronic copy of the proposal (see PDC-RFP-2020-01, Section VII. Specific Proposal Instructions).

III. Pre-Proposal Conference Sign-in Sheet and Presentation Materials

A copy of the sign-in sheet and presentation materials from the December 17, 2019 pre-proposal conference is attached.
Attachment

Sign-in Sheet and Presentation Materials
December 17, 2019 Pre-proposal Conference
PDC-RFP-2020-01
## SIGN-IN SHEET

**Meeting:** Pre-Proposal Conference for PDC-RFP-2020-01  
**Date:** December 17, 2019  
**Time:** 1:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Stewart</td>
<td>EX2 Technology LLC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ss.warren@ex2technology.com">ss.warren@ex2technology.com</a></td>
<td>757-666-5384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Dodson</td>
<td>CAS Severn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdodson@cassevern.com">cdodson@cassevern.com</a></td>
<td>804-391-9288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Pullman</td>
<td>SPARQ Global</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dpullman@sparglobal.com">dpullman@sparglobal.com</a></td>
<td>757-669-2888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natale Carollo</td>
<td>AMT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ncarollo@amtengineering.com">ncarollo@amtengineering.com</a></td>
<td>757-484-3930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Coddock</td>
<td>Vansant + Gusler, Inc</td>
<td>tcc@vansant+gusler.com</td>
<td>757-461-6757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALE PASLEY</td>
<td>JADE CREEK LLC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DALE.PASLEY@JADECREEKLCC.COM">DALE.PASLEY@JADECREEKLCC.COM</a></td>
<td>571-229-8611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Stouard</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:anthony.stouard@jadeclerk.com">anthony.stouard@jadeclerk.com</a></td>
<td>443-867-5194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Parker</td>
<td>UT-Services Inc</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mparker@ut-services.com">mparker@ut-services.com</a></td>
<td>757-550-6788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Catell</td>
<td>1HRPDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil Dale</td>
<td>Magellan Advisors</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ed@magellan-advisors.com">ed@magellan-advisors.com</a></td>
<td>757-253-1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Bean</td>
<td>City of Suffolk</td>
<td>KBEAME.SUFFOLKVA.CS</td>
<td>757-554-7253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Phone No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Klett</td>
<td>Kleit Consulting Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mark.kleit@kcc-inc.net">Mark.kleit@kcc-inc.net</a></td>
<td>757-721-5040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Rentz</td>
<td>SNS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CRENTZ@TEAMSNS.COM">CRENTZ@TEAMSNS.COM</a></td>
<td>757-819-7647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ebner</td>
<td>KCI Technologies Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WEBNER@KCI.com">WEBNER@KCI.com</a></td>
<td>443-909-0672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Mills</td>
<td>WSP USA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Chris.mills@wsp.com">Chris.mills@wsp.com</a></td>
<td>757-444-9718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Chambers</td>
<td>Kimley-Horn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jon.chambers@kimley-horn.com">jon.chambers@kimley-horn.com</a></td>
<td>757-213-8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Gruzd</td>
<td>Kimley-Horn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeremy.gruzd@kimley-horn.com">jeremy.gruzd@kimley-horn.com</a></td>
<td>757-213-8628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Maynard</td>
<td>Cable Associates Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JSMAYNARD@cableassociatesinc.com">JSMAYNARD@cableassociatesinc.com</a></td>
<td>757-592-1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Midkiff</td>
<td>Cable Associates Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GEMIDKIFF@cableassociatesinc.com">GEMIDKIFF@cableassociatesinc.com</a></td>
<td>252-592-1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Schneider</td>
<td>UT-Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gschneider@ut-services.com">gschneider@ut-services.com</a></td>
<td>757.418.1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Smith</td>
<td>HRPDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danetta Janosky</td>
<td>HRPDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Deerby</td>
<td>City of Norfolk</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Steven.deberry@noshbk.gov">Steven.deberry@noshbk.gov</a></td>
<td>757-323-7982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ON BEHALF OF THE
SOUTHSIDE NETWORK AUTHORITY

HAMPTON ROADS REGION
SOUTHSIDE REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY
RING 100% DESIGN

PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE
HAMPTON ROADS PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
DECEMBER 17, 2019

Request for Proposals

HRPDC, on behalf of the Southside Network Authority (Authority), is soliciting proposals to establish a contract to complete the final 100% design work for the Southside Regional Connectivity Ring (RCR).

- **RFP and Scope of work**
  - [https://www.hrpdcv.gov/page/procurement/](https://www.hrpdcv.gov/page/procurement/)
  - [https://www.hrtpo.org/page/procurement/](https://www.hrtpo.org/page/procurement/)

- **Reference Materials** (PDFs available at links above)
  - Hampton Roads Regional Connectivity Ring Master Plan
  - Hampton Roads Regional Connectivity Ring 30% Pre-Engineering Design Report
  - Hampton Roads Regional Connectivity Ring 30% Design Drawings
Southside Fiber Ring

- Oversight by Broadband Steering Committee
- 30% Design Complete
- Governance Structure – Broadband Authority
- RFP for Final Design/Construction Drawings

Request for Proposals (continued)

Roles and Responsibilities:
- Southside Network Authority: Contracting authority
- HRPDC: Procurement support

Southside Network Authority:
- Contract Issuance
- Contract administration
- Project management & oversight

HRPDC:
- Procurement process
- Staff support

Selected Offeror:
- Scope of work
- Project deliverables
Southside Network Authority

Background:
- Established in November 2019 by the 5 member Cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach
- Formed as a political subdivision under the Virginia Wireless Service Authorities Act (Code of Virginia, §15.2-5431.1 et seq.)
- Serves an essential public purpose by:
  - Increasing the speed and availability of broadband Internet and information services
  - Enabling private investment in the marketplace to be better targeted to serving the public
  - Creating jobs and increasing the tax base of the Cities and the region as a whole

Southside Regional Connectivity Ring 100% Design Project

Background:
- Regional Connectivity Ring Master Plan
- 30% Pre-Engineering Design Report
- 30% Design Drawings
Schedule of Upcoming Events
(subject to change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publish RFP Addendum #1</td>
<td>December 20, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Address schedule changes and procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish RFP Addendum #2</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Address engineering/technical questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Extend deadline for proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Submission of Proposals</td>
<td>January 14, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To be extended to 2:00 p.m. EDT on the 25th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calendar day after publication of Addendum #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Shortlist</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentations</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Award Notice</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Award</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal Evaluation

Selection will be made on the basis of the following factors* and the results of any oral presentations

| Factors                                                        | Value |
|                                                               |       |
| Offeror's General Approach to the Project                     | 30%   |
| Innovation and Creativity                                     | 25%   |
| Qualifications and Experience                                 | 20%   |
| Experience involving multiple local jurisdictions/agencies    | 10%   |
| DBE/SWaM Participation                                        | 10%   |
| Cost                                                           | 5%    |

* See RFP, p. 10 for detailed information on DBE/SWaM Participation and Cost factors
Questions?

All questions and answers will be documented in the December 20, 2019 addendum

Please monitor websites for updated information:
http://hrpdcvva.gov/page/procurement/
https://www.hrtpo.org/page/procurement/

Addendum #1
Procurement Questions to be Addressed

Questions received by 2:00 on 12/16/19

1. Will each offeror be able to bid both engineering and construction for the project?

2. Can the alternative concepts stated in the RFP include full turnkey design/build project management and operation of the RCR?

3. Please clarify alternative concepts.

4. If the Offeror, a SWaM certified contractor, intends to complete 100% of the work outlined, does the offeror fulfill the DBE/Swam 10% requirement?

5. Will non-DBE companies performing all services in-house with no subcontractors be considered since DBE requirements would not be met? Will companies that are not DBE certified and do not meet the DBE requirements be considered?
Addendum #1 (continued)

Procurement Questions to be Addressed

6. Page 10 Item A: 10% of the evaluation is based on “DBE/SWaM Participation.” On this page and p.13 it is stated that a 10% DBE participation goal has been established. Will the use of SWaMs (who are not necessarily DBE) be considered towards that 10% goal? Or will it strictly be based on DBEs?

7. Page 7 item E.: Please confirm that proprietary information should reference Form 8, not Form 9.

8. Page 9 Trade Secrets: Please confirm that proprietary information should reference Form 8, not Form 9 and that Form 9 “References”, can be included with proprietary information.

9. Page 19: 49 CFR Part 26... Form 6. Should these forms be included in our printed/PDF proposals? Or emailed/faxed as indicated at the bottom of the form?

Addendum #2

Technical Questions to be Addressed

Questions received by 2:00 on 12/16/19

1. RFP states the design must address Cyber Security. Can you elaborate how these requirements would be related to the OSP design?

2. How does cyber security requirements impact dark fiber design?

3. How should cyber security be addressed in the proposal?

4. Attachment 2, Section III, sub-section E – Shall the cyber securities issues address the physical outside plant and/or the equipment to be installed to monitor the dark fiber network? Please explain.

5. RFP mentions cad drawings. Many of the new fiber design software solutions like 3-gis are great design tools for creating construction prints, and integrate with Arc-gis, but are not considered “cad files.” Will it be acceptable to use 3-gis to create the design rather than AutoCAD or MicroStation?
Addendum #2 (continued)

Technical Questions to be Addressed

6. Page 50: Provide design drawings VIII. Data and Deliverables: Please provide clarification regarding the preferred programs for design and the expected file deliverables. Our preference would be to develop detailed design plans in AutoCAD and export shapefiles that can be added to ArcGIS; however, we would like to know if there are specific attributes that will need to be included in each Shapefile.

7. Are both CAD and GIS required? Is there an alternative to CAD deliverable?

8. Can offerors rely on City GIS information (in each respective municipality) for Parcel boundaries and right-of-way widths, or does this need to be Surveyed for the entire corridor?

9. Purpose – page 4. “The 100% design work shall provide construction level drawings and all necessary work to secure permits and approvals needed to allow the Fiber Ring to proceed to construction.” Please confirm that all environmental, Storm water management, VMRC, COE, traffic control, etc. permitting are to be included in proposal.

Addendum #2 (continued)

Technical Questions to be Addressed

10. Attachment 2, Section III, sub-section G: Will railroad or bridge crossings and/or attachment fees be paid by the Authority? Would offeror only be charging for preparation of permits?

11. The 30% Drawings show proposed routes. Is there latitude / flexibility to revise these routes if needed?

12. Page 50: “Act on the Authority’s behalf in rights-of-way negotiations...” : Is the Authority planning segments to be designed and constructed outside of existing public rights-of-way? Other than potential laterals to communication hub facilities?

13. There is no Central office location listed, will the RCR originate from Corporate Landings and General Booth as per the 30% drawings?

14. RFP calls for construction ready drawings. How will you be handling issues with Wetlands and railroad crossing?
Addendum #2 (continued)

Technical Questions to be Addressed

15. Does Offeror need to design to fiber termination points? What are the demarcation or termination points?
16. Related to Question [15], what are the fiber requirements for the network? Is fiber splicing diagrams and assignments part of the scope?
17. No network or splicing details are listed, will this be done at a later time?
18. Page #51 RFP, item E, states no splicing will be considered. Can you clarify this statement? There will need to be several splice locations within the 103-mile route.
19. Page 51: Technical requirements item B. Please clarify. It currently reads "Fiber will not be direct buried installed in conduit." Is that supposed to be: "Fiber will not be direct buried. It shall be installed in conduit."
20. Please clarify conduit requirement specifications: (2) 3" conduits or (3) 2" conduits as mentioned in document.

Addendum #2 (continued)

Technical Questions to be Addressed

21. The specifications call out for a 10" conduit on bridge crossings, which may not be possible, due to its diameter & weight. Will alternative conduit sizes, like a 4" conduit with (3) innerducts be considered?
22. What are the specs / condition of existing conduit runs called out on the 30% Drawings? Are they empty or occupied with other cables?
23. Fiber Route Design Services, K. – page 50. “Provide for underground facility conduit design, conduit detailing, handhole detailing, prepare all forms and documentation for approval of conduit construction and/or installation, and verify as-builts.” Please clarify task of verifying as-builts. If no inspection or construction management is included in RFP and ring will be 100% underground, offeror will only be able to verify visible above ground features after construction is complete. Who is responsible for as-builts?
Addendum #2 (continued)

Technical Questions to be Addressed

24. On page #50 of the RFP, item O, states the bidder is required to label all network components, to clarify this requirement, are you stating these network components need to be labeled on the design prints, or is the designer responsible to physically label each network component in the field?

25. The Master Plan mentioned that the RCR will have a dedicated NOC to monitor the status of the ring, power alarms and performance issues – who is responsible for this facility? What coordination will be required for this project?

26. Attachment 2, Section V, sub-section F- Please explain PE certification details. “If required by funding source”

27. Page 55: How many paper copies should be estimated for delivery to the Authority for each submittal (60%, 90%, 100%)? And what sizes? 11”x17”? 24”x36”? 