



ADDENDUM NO. I

DATE: December 6, 2021
TO: All Potential Proposers
FROM: James McKeehan, Assistant Purchasing Agent, City of Knoxville
SUBJECT: Addendum No. I to RFP-Utility Damage Prevention and Related Services
PROPOSALS TO BE OPENED: December 10, 2021 at 11:00 am Eastern Time

This addendum is being published to provide clarification regarding the above referenced ITB. This addendum becomes a part of the contract documents and modifies the original specifications as follows:

1. What type of records will be provided (i.e. paper, GIS,)?
Response: We have electronic records that contain a monthly list of the locating activity (request number, address, contractor, transmit date/time, start/end time, county, work type, etc.)
2. The lighting system was stressed in the RFP, is this the sole intent of the Utility Damage Prevention and Related services RFP, to locate just the lighting system or is it the entirety of City owned property?
 - a. Is this deemed private property?
Response: Some locations may be within private property.
 - b. What other utilities will this RFP require to be marked?
Response: Just street lighting
3. The RFP indicated 16,553 tickets in 2020 which included normal and after hours notifications.
 - a. How many after-hours notifications were issued?
Response: 404
 - b. How many of these 16,553 tickets were screened and did not require site visits?
Response: The contractor did not provide this data.
 - c. Are the mentioned 16,553 tickets received all for lighting system only?
Response: Yes
4. In section 5.3 the RFP notes to “screen the locate tickets so that trips and associated charges are reduced, such as a map check before field investigation.” But, in 5.8, the RFP indicates the contractor is to assume full responsibility even if the work, prints, drawings, plans, or specifications issued by the City indicate or fail to indicate the existing overhead, surface, and underground facility. How can the contractor screen tickets without a site visit without confidence in the existing records provided by the City?
Response: The intent of this is that city infrastructure does not change or move for the most part. However, tickets continue to come in for the same area repeatedly during the year. We are asking the locator that if they have been to an area and it continues to be a clear out please don't make unnecessary trips.
5. Section 5.4 says, “Contractor shall be responsible for the maintenance of its marks up to the start of the excavation.” We understand this to mean that it is the excavator’s responsibility to inform the one-call system of the need to remark the facility per the Underground Utility Prevention Act.
Response: This is correct. Locator needs to refreshen marks leading up to excavation.
6. What does a “valve box clean-out” entail?
 - a. What documentation will be required for this service?
Response: Under the hourly charge this item and the “location of sewer lateral” reference should be removed.



7. What type of deliverable would the GPS coordinate locating require?
a. Are there any specific pieces of equipment preferred or required?
Response: No, however the preferred locating equipment should be able to detect more frequencies than your standard locating device detects.
8. What is the current price you are paying currently for the locating of your underground utilities?
Response: \$10.19 is the Call-Out Rate and \$6.79 is the Regular Rate.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. I