The following is additional information regarding Request for Proposal # DIT-160108, titled **Technical Audit/Evaluation of Cable Systems: WaveDivision I, LLC and Comcast Cable Communications**. RFP-160108 was released on 06/15/16, and the due date and time for responses is 06/30/16 @ 12pm Pacific. This addendum includes both questions from prospective proposers and the City’s answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a proposal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item # | Date Received | Date Answered | Vendor’s Question | City’s Response | RFP Revisions |
| 1 | 6/23/16 | 6/23/16 | The RFP references both WaveDivision I, LLC and Comcast. However, in some areas of the RFP, specifically in the Scope and Scope Tasks, only Wave is clearly referenced. Is it the City’s intent to evaluate Wave’s system and, while doing so, report on any findings related to Comcast’s system that may be co-located with Wave’s system? | Wave’s cable network is the primary focus of the work. Our spot check of Comcast is restricted to pole mounted and drop issues. Wave and Comcast overlap in a few areas of the city. In those cases reporting on both would be advisable. However, we would expect a few Comcast “spot checks” in areas not served by Wave, particularly in those areas that are adjacent to Wave.  |  |
| 2 | 6/23/16 | 6/23/16 | Does the City intend the “spot checks” of Comcast be only in the Wave service area or throughout the entire City? | See answer above. We do not believe it will be necessary for Comcast spot checks throughout the city.  |  |
| 3 | 6/23/16 | 6/23/16 | As part of the project, the Consultant most likely will need to obtain certain information needed for the technical audit through execution of an NDA with the cable operators. The cable operators will most likely indicate that if this information is shared with the City, it must be protected from public disclosure under RCW 19.108. If the City does not agree, then the Consultant would likely not be able to provide such information to the City. Would the City then see this as an allowable exemption to the City’s information provision requirements under Section 23 of the contract? | We have worked with NDAs in the past and are willing to consider such an arrangement. That said, we do not believe that the information we are requesting meets the definition of trade secrets under the Uniform Trade Secrets Act. If necessary, the burden of proof would be on the cable operator to substantiate such a claim. Moreover, the franchises and the Seattle Municipal Code require cable operators to make available to the City any records the City may need to assess compliance with the franchise and applicable laws and regulations. The cable operator is free to note information supplied as confidential. If the City were to receive a request for disclosure we would give the operator an opportunity to enjoin the City from disclosing such information.  |  |
| 4 | 6/23/16 | 6/23/16 | Our firm can participate in the mandatory teleconference interview on July 12, 2016, but is already obligated to participate in a franchise –related closed Executive Session the morning of July 12th. Is it possible to schedule the interview in the afternoon that day? | We will be interviewing all day on July 12th. We will do our best to accommodate specific requests. We will work with you when we arrange the schedule. |  |
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