

## Table of Contents

Seattle Center Remote Questions & Answers Session (10/31/22) – Part 2 .....	2
<b>Conduit, Fiber, Power</b> .....	2
<b>Agreement</b> .....	3
<b>Misc.</b> .....	5

## Seattle Center Remote Questions & Answers Session (10/31/22) – Part 2

### Conduit, Fiber, Power

1. **Q: What size conduits and how many conduits would Seattle Center allow?**

**A:** While the size and number of conduits will need to be assessed based on specific location considerations, an example of what might be approved are the 4 - 4" digital signage conduit runs placed under vacated streets on campus in 2020. There are also interior conduit pathway opportunities with some limitations available to support the system.

2. **Q: For any installation of conduit/fiber required by the NH DAS, the RFP requires that deployment must include additional conduit and/fiber for use by Seattle Center. To adhere to this requirement additional sizing of conduit/fiber will be required at additional costs. What requirement for fiber and/or conduit size is required by the Seattle Center for future use expectations?**

**A:** Conduit, innerduct and fiber placed for Seattle Center is intended to allow the Center to take advantage of the new wireless system construction to improve the Center's network capabilities. Details will be determined during design.

3. **Q: Understanding the RFP stipulation regarding using Seattle Center power distribution, in the event the power utility company does not allow a separate service to be brought in, is it possible to upgrade or augment the existing Seattle Center power distribution? It may be possible to feed the system through other power means (such as digital power), but we may need a source to start from. And we may also need power at remote locations/poles.**

**A:** Any system will require power. If the utility does not want to provide an alternate service, Seattle Center would then investigate if an existing service can be increased. Auxiliary power needs such as routers and field control units would require minimal power and would most likely be able to tap existing or upgraded specific build power services. However, the head-end unit location may be limited to where Seattle City Light can provide additional power to operate.

Augmented power is worth considering and would satisfy some other energy goals of the city possibly.

For remote locations, the WIP would need to establish power at those locations.

4. **Q: In order to help support any preliminary/sample design of the campus coverage solution the RFP highlight to provide details to conduit runs/size of conduits; it will be important to have some level of property drawings to help identify distances/locations. Does Seattle Center have high level construction drawings around existing conduit paths, geo information, etc.? If so, can they be provided?**

**A:** Seattle Center has a 70% data and power site map. Please visit RFP web page, <https://seattlecenter.com/wireless-rfp> to access the PDF file. Please note that the data and

power site map information should be field verified for accuracy and should not be solely relied on to make decisions. Seattle Center/City of Seattle are not liable for inaccurate information in the data and power site map.

5. **Q: The minimum point of entry (MPOE) for the property (or multiple MPOEs if that is the situation)?**

**A:** There is access to multiple backhaul providers on campus and KOMO Plaza, located nearby, serves as a hub for additional providers.

6. **Q: The Request for Proposal (RFP) notes the Wireless Infrastructure Provider (WIP) shall not have access to use Seattle Center's power distribution. Are WIPs expected to order a separate power meter from the City and build our own distribution on the property?**

**A:** Yes. In their Proposals, all Request for Proposal (RFP) Respondents should assume that the network will be built with independent, not Seattle Center or City-owned, systems (power, conduit, fiber). The selected Wireless Infrastructure Provider (WIP) may have some opportunities to collaborate on use of any extra capacity of Seattle Center infrastructure; however, that will be based on condition-specific reviews with successful WIP.

### Agreement

7. **Q: Will the winning proponent be granted exclusivity rights under the contract?**

**A:** Seattle Center understands that certain exclusivity rights will be a desire of the selected Respondent/WIP. But Seattle Center's goal is to allow for service and coverage by all service providers. In reviewing the Proposals, Seattle Center will be looking for how Respondents address this inherent issue and concern. Exclusivity rights will be considered when the lease or contract with the successful WIP is negotiated and finalized and may depend on the type of infrastructure that will be deployed.

8. **Q: Will Seattle Center consider a model whereby the winning proponent owns the system, and ownership does not transfer upon termination?**

**A:** Ownership will depend on the type of infrastructure that will be deployed. Seattle Center is not envisioning new infrastructure or structures to be permanently owned by the WIP. However, this could be more of a possibility for antennas (on buildings or poles owned by Seattle Center), or for underground fiber/conduit. Again, the possibility of private ownership will be considered when the lease or contract with the successful WIP is negotiated and finalized. In reviewing the Proposals, Seattle Center will need to understand Respondents' expectations if new infrastructure will be built, as well as expectations for wireless attachments/collocations.

9. **Will Seattle Center consider a longer period of time than 6 months for obtaining contractual agreements with Carriers, that would be more in line with actual carrier commitment schedules, taking into account design and budget approval processes?**

**A:** If there are reasonable constraints to obtaining contractual commitments with Carriers within 6 months, then yes, a longer time period will be considered. The City's preference will be for timely implementation of Carrier agreements.

10. **RFP highlights that the WIP will not be allowed to use Seattle Center's power distribution. Experience with City of Seattle addition to the power grid has shown that the processing and implementation of additional dedicated power has a 2-year backlog. Would the city be willing to allow for a lengthy cycle time considering the RFP focus on the WIP's schedule for construction of infrastructure to be substantially completed within reasonably short duration of the signing of agreements?**

**A:** We will work collaboratively with our selected partner to navigate these concerns and provide support through internal City channels as appropriate.

11. **Is Seattle Center willing to consider a total capital investment over the term, rather than annually, as after the initial Network is constructed, there will likely be no immediate upgrades necessary?**

**A:** Yes, alternative proposals would be considered.

12. **Would Seattle Center consider making the first of the five (5) year extension options automatic if certain criteria are met? A longer term is more attractive for carrier participation.**

**A:** If there are financial and operating advantages to the City for making the first five (5) year extension option period automatic, that option would be considered. Note that anything longer than five (5) years will require City Council approval.

13. **Are there existing agreements with wireless carriers for Seattle Center? If so, how much term remains on these agreements, and are there any termination rights for Seattle Center for those agreements?**

**A:** There are five existing temporary locations that are covered by annual license agreements with AT&T, T-Mobile, and Verizon. Four are rooftop deployments and the fifth is on the top floor of the Mercer St. Garage. The expectation is that all will be replaced with the new system. It is important to ensure a smooth transition for the coverage provided by the temporary sites to the new system and consistent service to campus visitors. Note that Seattle Center did not require the same aesthetic standards for current facilities because they are temporary; Seattle Center will expect more stealth/better visual integration for the permanent system.

## Misc.

14. **Q: Is the City expecting any zoning and/or permit process for the overall plan or individual poles? Or is there an expedited review cycle that encompasses the “permit” approval to be based on approving the RF plan and subsequent construction drawings?**

**A:** Building permits are required from Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections (SDCI) and the WIP will be responsible for any other specialty permits (e.g., electrical). Note that all permit set drawings will be required to be reviewed and approved by Seattle Center prior to submittal. Vacated streets on campus are under control and management of Seattle Center. Work in vacated streets on campus do not require Street Use permits from Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT).

15. **RFP highlights if new supporting structures for wireless antenna are required, these structures should leave attachment space for use by Seattle Center at Seattle Center discretion. Since any new supporting structures will requirement permitting for size, load structure, aesthetics, etc., any new structure additions would need understanding regarding Seattle Centers requirement considerations in order to provide appropriate attachment planning. What type of Seattle Center input on potential attachments/details can be provided for consideration and understanding to ensure proper planning of new supporting structures?**

**A:** New supporting structures may be used in the future to place non-licensed wireless devices including IOT, Wi-Fi, cameras, radios etc. Details to be determined during wireless system design.