



**Date:** June 13, 2024

**Addendum #:** 2

**Project Name:** Pole Inspection Program

**Bid Due Date:** Thursday, July 11, 2024, at 2:00PM EST

Please see the attachment to this addendum for answers/clarifications to all questions submitted by the deadline on Monday, June 10, 2024.

## 2024 Pole Inspection/Testing RFP

| Question | Answer   |
|----------|--|
| 1        | The language of the SOW reads “sonic/sound and selective bore testing.” (e.g., p.3, specifications, A.5.a.i.) Does that mean that a sound inspection may be used in lieu of a sonic test or that the bidder must use sonic testing alongside the sound?<br>This means that a sound inspection may be used in lieu of a sonic test.   |
| 2        | What specs do you use for violations of Foreign Contacts?<br>All pertinent NESC clearances (on vertical structures; above ground, water, rail; horizontal clearances from buildings, etc.)   |
| 3        | Could we possibly bid the F.C. Audit as a separate “off season” project? Test this year and over the winter go and do the audit?<br>Yes. As per the June 6 addendum, the completion date was moved out to March 31, 2025. No further scheduling requirements were detailed.  |
| 4        | How do we know what 10% of the job would be? Why do we need a bond if there is zero construction? We do not do anything as far as changing the system or leaving equipment anywhere. Its just a few guys walking or driving the lines.<br>For the purposes of Bid Bond calculation assume:<br>-6927 will be visually test<br>-5195 poles will be sounded<br>-1300 will be bored and partially excavated  |
| 5        | Will the Foreign Attachment Audit/Code Violations data be recorded in the ESRI GIS application? If not, does TCLP have a desired method or format of receiving the information?<br>Yes they will be recorded in the ESRI GIS application   |
| 6        | Does TCLP have a specific EOS Arrow GPS/GNSS receiver that they want used, or will any <1’ accuracy EOS Arrow receiver suffice?<br>TCLP does have a device to use, but the responder can use their device as long as it utilized the MDOT CORS system for accuracy ( <a href="https://mdotcors.michigan.gov/sbc/Account/Index?returnUrl=%2Fsbcb">https://mdotcors.michigan.gov/sbc/Account/Index?returnUrl=%2Fsbcb</a> )   |
| 7        | Does TCLP have any annual or maintenance permits with MDOT, City of Traverse City, or Grand Traverse County?<br>We have annual permits for working in Grand Traverse County, and along MDOT roads. We are technically part of the City and only need to submit permits for excavations within the road right of way.   |
| 8        | Does TCLP have an estimated number of Sound tests & Bore Tests that they think will be performed. What quantities should be used to estimate contract total for bid bond?<br>For the purposes of Bid Bond calculation assume:<br>-6927 will be visually test<br>-5195 poles will be sounded<br>-1300 will be bored and partially excavated   |
| 9        | Will TCLP provide badges or something similar to assist the contractor to prove they are working for TCLP when doing back easement work?<br>We typically have magnetic signs for vehicles that state that the vendor is a contractor working for TCLP. It is required that the successful bidder employees are well identified through their own logos, etc. However, I can work with our IT department if badges are needed.  |
| 10       | Does TCLP want any additional information with the bid (equipment spec sheets, company narrative, project schedule/Gantt Chart, etc.) with the bid or only the three documents stated in the RFP?<br>Additional information is welcome but not required beyond that stated in the RFP.   |
| 11       | A.5.a.v. stipulates that pole ownership is one feature to be updated from the source data provided. How is determination of pole ownership to be made?<br>This will typically only be an issue for poles found that are not on the maps. This would require a phone call to the Operations Manager who will investigate and obtain an answer. TCLP would not delay the completion of the project with any data that remains unresolved with respect to pole ownership. This could also be an issue say, if a pole is labeled as AT&T-owned, but they are not on the pole. This would likely require a communication ato the Operations Manager as well for confirmation. |
| 12       | A.5.b.i. describes expectations for a foreign attachment audit. Approximately how many attachers are in the TCLP service area?<br>Approximately 10 main licensees.   |
| 13       | How up to date is the source data on reflecting these attachments?<br>There has not been a Joint Use inventory in recent history.  |
| 14       | Is TCLP planning to share the costs of this audit with these attachers?<br>It is likely that we will do so with AT&T and perhaps Charter.  |
| 15       | If so, what plans are in place to secure their cooperation?<br>We have an agreement with both Charter and AT&T regarding this. We will provide them the timeframe for the inventory should we decide to move forward with that optional part of the bid.   |
| 16       | We would like permission from Traverse City to notify AT&T that we intend to bid on a potential Joint Use Audit that they may want to participate in. Is Traverse City OK with us notifying AT&T or our intent to bid this work?<br>Yes. TCLP is currently renegotiating our agreement with AT&T and their representative has been notified that we are planning to do this.   |
| 17       | We would request that we provide an alternative to your proposal and use our purpose-built tools to complete the project. It would result in higher data quality and a lower costs and we would provide the end result in a ESRI File Geodatabase for upload into the City’s GIS. Please let us know if an alternative proposal would be acceptable.<br>Please provide a bid that is for the use of TCLP’s GIS tool in order to avoid data migration issues. You are welcome to propose alternatives in addition to the standard submittal.  |
| 18       | Are there any requirements to install any type of inspection tags on the poles after the inspection has been completed?<br>Yes. Please propose a tag that you commonly use in your response.   |
| 19       | Once a pole is rejected in the inspection process, are there requirements to physically tag or label the pole as rejected? If so, what are those requirements?<br>TCLP would like field identification for failed poles only but are not insisting upon a particular methodology. Please describe how you normally identify these in the field in your response.   |
| 20       | Is TCLP open to an alternate inspection for identifying below ground level decay using a digital wood inspection drill?<br>Please respond to bids as requested; however, alternate proposals will be reviewed.   |
| 21       | For the Supplemental Services, how does TCLP want the data delivered (Excel, Field Map, other) ?<br>They will be captured in the ESRI GIS application supplied by TCLP.  |
| 22       | Are there any requirements to report defective equipment other than imminent hazards? If so, what are those requirements?<br>No, just imminent hazards are required to be reported (aside from pole test results).   |
| 23       | Does TCLP require Miss Dig request for partial excavation of poles?<br>MISS DIG rules are governed by the state of Michigan, not TCLP. The agreement with the successful bidder will reference the successful bidder having to follow applicable laws and regulations.   |