



Department of Administration
State Office Building Suite 801
PO Box 110210
Juneau, AK 99811-0210

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: 10/7/2020

RFP TITLE:
**DRAFT ARCS and Satellite Management, Operations & Technical
Monitoring, Digital Upgrade, Trouble Line Support and ARCS Site
Survey
2021-0200-4665**

AMENDMENT 2

NOTE: it is the offeror's responsibility to review and accept all amendments to this solicitation.

This amendment is issued to revise Sec. 1.10 RFP Schedule and to address interested offerors questions.

1) This amendment serves to amend and revise Sec. 1.10 RFP Schedule:

SEC. 1.10 RFP SCHEDULE

RFP schedule set out herein represents the state's best estimate of the schedule that will be followed. If a component of this schedule, such as the deadline for receipt of proposals, is delayed, the rest of the schedule may be shifted accordingly. All times are Alaska Time.

ACTIVITY	TIME	DATE
Issue Date / DRAFT RFP Released		9/15/2020
Pre-Proposal Conference	10:30 AM	9/18/2020
DRAFT RFP Period Ends		9/25/20
Deadline to Submit Questions (first round)	2:30 PM	9/28/20
Questions Responded to by	TBD	10/7/20
Deadline to Submit Questions (final round)	2:30 PM	10/12/20
Questions Responded to by		10/16/20
FINAL RFP Posted		10/16/20
Deadline for Receipt of Proposals / Proposal Due Date	2:30 PM	11/6/20
Proposal Evaluations Complete		11/17/20
Notice of Intent to Award		11/19/20
Contract Issued		11/30/20
Contract Start		1/1/2021

2) This amendment serves to include and make part the following question:

- 1) Pg 4 1.02 Budget: Elaborate on the budget for the project.

ANSWER: Capital appropriation and budget will depend on the type of proposals received.

- 2) What is the period that people can submit questions? Is it 10/1 or earlier?

ANSWER: Questions can be submitted through September 30th.

- 3) Who is the incumbent?

ANSWER: APBI

- 4) How do you accommodate for travel in the age of COVID?

ANSWER: Awarded vendor would need to adhere to community requirements related to travel for each location requiring tower maintenance.

- 5) 6.19 Is it fair to say after BAFO, negotiations will not include price? Will you request BAFO from all bidders or only ones you are in negotiations with?

ANSWER: Please see RFP Section 5.01 and 6.18.

- 6) Who has been assigned as the Project Manager?

ANSWER: Deputy Commissioner Dave Donley

- 7) What are the response requirements for lots we do not bid on (say, if we bid on Lot 2 solely? Do we need to turn in anything for the other lots?)

ANSWER: Submit the submittal forms and cost sheet for the lot(s) you are responding to.

- 8) The negotiation parameters listed in Sec. 6.19 states negotiations will take place in Juneau, in-person. Given the ongoing coronavirus pandemic, can negotiating take place telephonically or online (using a platform like Zoom)?

ANSWER: Yes.

- 9) Is there any further information the Department can furnish on the DTV Deployment?

ANSWER: Information provided with Amendment #1.

- 10) **The RFP fails to account for information on record as it pertains to consideration of ARCS audio service users.** KCAW, on behalf of multiple rural & statewide public radio stations, made the timely submission of information in response ("Response") to the RFI issued by the Department of Administration ("Department") on May 4th, 2020 (attached). On July 31st, Commissioner Donley issued a document entitled "DOA Public Broadcasting RFI Responses May 2020," noting 'emphasis added to major ideas for change' with regards to submitted information. This document is also attached.

- There is no indication that any of the content of KCAW's response was materially considered in the Department's generation of RFP 2021-0200-4665, and is further evidenced by the omission of the State's audio services customers (which include

many of the stations co-signed on the Response) in sections 2.01 and 3.01. Most importantly, the RFP does not account at all for the service needs of ARCS audio services user-stations in its scope of work.

- **I am petitioning the Department to include more detailed information on how a respondent, particularly to LOT 1 & 3, will need to serve the ARCS audio services users**, who currently pay to use this service. I am not satisfied that this RFP, nor the respondents to the RFP, represents the interests of paying ARCS audio service users.
- Without consideration to *how* a respondent will serve the needs of the stations who use ARCS as an audio service, the State is misconstruing the ARCS service and its users. Audio service users are a part of the Emergency Alert System Plan, and interruption to the audio feeds to the radio translator networks neglects the State's public safety obligations.
- To wit: **ARCS is not simply a TV service. It is also a radio service, with paying radio station clients.**
- Acceptable relief may take the form of: a specific outline of the cost caps and customer/technical service expectations demanded of RFP respondents for audio service users, including an audio service user (such as KCAW) on the RFP selection/review process.

ANSWER: This is a draft RFP and the State is looking for specific solutions from our vendor community on how to provide the audio service requirement.

11) The RFP aligns with service needs of ARCS communities but appears nescient of consequences in relying on commercial alternatives. In section 2.01, the Department outlines the "Private Commercial Rural Television Information," listing a number of current and potential vendors. The implicit understanding in this section of the RFP is: there are viable alternatives to the ARCS service. However, a comparison between the communities listed in this section to the "ARCS Deployment Contact List" and "ARCS Lat and Long Coordinates" documents plainly demonstrates that there is no current or potential commercial ISP or satellite entertainment provider that can remotely duplicate ARCS.

- KCAW additionally questions how the actual needs of the listed communities are ascertained without meaningfully engaging their local populations for preference — this remains unanswered. During the APBC special meeting on August 6th, Commissioner Donley stated multiple times that "there's been no survey" of the ARCS service, but that "my estimate is that 90% of Alaskans" have access to paid service.
 - KCAW would be interested in knowing the disposition of Commissioner Donley's informal survey of ARCS sites; on the same call as listed about, Commissioner Donley stated that "there are many sites where I've telephoned and actually talked to them" about ARCS.
 - It's unclear as to how Commissioner Donley could do this research, since one of the primary biddable lots is to compile this information for the Department. For a specific example, we refer to the Angoon entry on the ARCS Deployment Contact List.

Community	Organization	Contact	Contact #	Contact Email
Alakanuk	NA	Gary Okpik	907-238-3207	
Aleknagik	NA	Norman Heyano	907-842-7133	
Ambler	City of Ambler	Ingemar Mathiason	907-445-2031/5034	
Angoon	City of Angoon	Alan Zuboff	907-788-3653	

ANSWER: This is a draft RFP and the State is looking for specific solutions from our vendor community on how to provide the audio service requirement.

- 12) The number listed is the phone number for City Hall, and is not specifically connected to the contact listed. Furthermore, had the Department reached out to the audio service user/provider for this community (KCAW,) we would have been of further assistance - having direct contact with numerous communications stakeholders in Angoon, having [conducted an assessment of both KCAW and ARCS properties in 2019](#).

ANSWER: The state is continuing to update information as it becomes available.

- 13) I am petitioning the Department to reassess the scope of work outlined in Section 3.01, LOT 1. The financial and logistical accessibility of commercial alternatives to ARCS do not comport to any explanation or direct proof of its existence. It is clear that the Department has made no conscious effort in the construction of this item to integrate contemplation or systematic process considerations to fulfill the State's public safety obligations.

ANSWER: Please provide a suggestion on what the State should do.

- 14) Acceptable relief may take the form of: further defining the "operation, monitoring, maintaining, and repairing" expectations of a bidder to LOT 1, outlining the precise usage of extant technologies versus the implied implementation of hypothetical services/technologies, including an audio service user (such as KCAW) on the RFP selection/review process.

ANSWER: Question is unclear. State is unable to provide an affirmative answer. The state would recommend vendors analyze the risks associated with it and respond with a sufficient buffer to anticipate the unknown costs.

- 15) What is the budget for the support of this contract solicitation? RFP states that the offeror will oversee a project budget for the equipment, freight, installation, administrative and contingency costs relative to the execution of the statewide digital upgrade project.

ANSWER: See the answer to question #1.

- 16) SOA plans a contract start date of January 1, 2021. How will SOA coordinate contract continuity in year 1 of the proposed contract period that is covered by 2 different FY budgets?

ANSWER: The state will assure that funds are available to execute the base contract and the following years will be based on appropriation.

17) Can SOA provide a copy of, State of Alaska (AAM 60.050, 06.240, 60.250)? Page 16 of solicitation.

ANSWER: <http://doa.alaska.gov/dof/manuals/aam/resource/60t.pdf>

18) How many FCC site licenses are the vendors expected to complete?

ANSWER: All FCC licensing work would be the responsibility of the vendor to complete. The vendor proposal will provide details on how they will manage any required licenses.

19) Who is responsible for the cost to file any required FCC license filing or modifications?

ANSWER: The state expects the vendor to propose a cost with their proposal to accomplish this work. Any required fees should be included in the proposal.

20) Is SOA responsible for all freight costs for any equipment needing shipment to remote locations?

ANSWER: The state expects the vendor to propose a cost with their proposal with a not to exceed for equipment shipment.

21) Can SOA confirm that the vendor is only required to coordinate the shipment of goods?

ANSWER: See answer to number #19.

22) Due to the aggressive July 2021 digital conversion completion date, would the SOA consider eliminating the 45-day prior approval to the travel date?

ANSWER: The state agrees to two weeks and the RFP will be amended.

23) For LOT 1, does SIP have a monitoring system that reports back transmitter and sat receiver alarms? If yes, how will vendors obtain that data?

ANSWER: No, SIP has no way to know if the ARCS transmitters are functioning or receiving the signal. Without initiating a registration protocol (similar to dish TV) the only way to know if ARCS transmitters are functioning is to inspect them or talk with someone who has.

24) For LOT 1, is there an alarm reporting system for the uplink?

ANSWER: SES does monitor the SIP uplink. SES uses "Monics" – a monitoring platform utilizing spectrum analysis – to ensure the uplink is working properly.

25) For LOT 1 and 2, does the vendor require any specialized test equipment to perform contracted work? If yes, will SOA have any available equipment for use by vendor?

ANSWER: It's the vendor's responsibility to have their own equipment.

26) For LOT 1 and 2, can SOA provide any existing site maintenance records with vendors?

ANSWER: The SOA is providing the "List of Sites", which lists ARCS sites that digital upgrades have been "deployed" to. The SOA provided the ARCS Deployment Contact List with Amendment #1 which identifies contact individuals and their phone numbers at these sites. The SOA is providing the trouble line log of telephone calls received regarding issues with ARCS sites.

- 27) For LOT 2, does the SOA expect to receive FCC extension request approval for digital upgrade completion date prior to solicitation due date?

ANSWER: At this time, we do not know if the FCC will grant an extension or exemption from the 2021 deadline to end analog transmission. The SOA does not know how many analog transmitters are currently still working but we suspect the number to be below 50. The SOA has not applied for an extension or exemption but may decide to do so.

- 28) For LOT 1 and 2, who is responsible for installation labor and first tier maintenance?

ANSWER: The awarded vendor.

- 29) How can bidders arrange a site visit to the SOA warehouse to view the equipment designated for the ARCS upgrade?

ANSWER: We will include a site visit in the final RFP. The site survey will be optional and at vendor's own cost. The state will not reimburse for travel or other expenses associated with the site survey.

- 30) Does the SOA have records of what equipment was shipped to each remote site that has not been installed or is only partially completed?

ANSWER: The SOA is providing the "List of Sites", which lists ARCS sites that digital upgrades have been "deployed" to. Other than a digital transmitter the SOA does not know what additional equipment was "deployed" on a site by site basis. Most sites on this list seem to have operational ARCS digital transmitters but it is unknown how many sites on this list are not currently operational.

- 31) How will the SOA arrange communication paths between vendors for Lot 1 and Lot 3 if they are not the same vendor? It seems that there may be duplication of work (ex. Site Surveys) if there is no communication.

ANSWER: The state will negotiate with the awarded vendors for a communication path at the time of award.