



Addendum No. Two

Date: March 21, 2022

RFP No: FY22-805-60 Parking and Ground Transportation Management Services

This Addendum # 2 to the Request for Proposals for Parking and Ground Transportation Management Services contains the following clarifications and changes to the RFP Document:

Question 1: RFP page 15 Section 14.9, c) Luggage Carts: Where are the luggage cart corrals located? Is the revenue associated with the luggage carts included in overall revenue to be used to calculate the management fee percentage? If so, can you provide three (3) years' revenue history for the luggage carts?

Response: Appendix E – (1) (a) (vi) Provides details about corral locations. The revenue associated with luggage cart returns is not included in the overall revenue to be used to calculate the management fee percentage.

Question 2: RFP page 19 Section 2.1.2 f) and RFP page 19 Section 2.1.3 and Section 2.1.4: These two sections seem to be asking for similar information. Is it acceptable to reference one of the sections in our response to avoid having to restate the information allowing us to reduce pages required?

Response: Yes, as long as all of the required information is provided.

Question 3: RFP page 18 Section 2.1.2 a) and b) and RFP page 21 Section 2.1.5: These two sections seem to be asking for similar information. Is it acceptable to reference one of the sections in our response to avoid having to restate the information allowing us to reduce pages required?

Response: Yes, as long as all of the required information is provided.

Question 4: RFP page 19, Section 2.1.3: Will the Airport allow bios for item B and C in lieu of actual resumes?

Response: Yes, as long as all of the required information is provided.

Question 5: RFP page 19, Section 2.1.3: Please confirm you are referring to Appendix J and not Appendix K in this section as well as in Section 1.4.5.

Response: Correct – Appendix J is the correct Appendix to reference.

Question 6: RFP page 13, Section 1.7c: The Airport is requiring the operator provide a parking guidance system. Does the Airport have any specifications or recommendations on parking guidance systems it prefers?

Response: It is up to the operator to recommend an appropriate parking guidance system.

Question 7: Does the Airport intend for the Operator to include the cost of the parking guidance system as part of its management fee and if so, will the cost of the system be a component of the management fee the airport described as 15% to 20% of parking revenue?

Response: Yes.

Question 8: RFP page 13, Section 1.7(1): The Operator is responsible to remit state and local sales taxes. To clarify, are those taxes to be reduced from gross revenue and not a cost attributable to the operator as a component of its management fee?

Response: The Management Fee shall be calculated after any and all applicable taxes are deducted from the gross receipts.

Question 9: Is the management fee percentage calculated on gross parking revenue or is it calculated on net revenue (gross revenue with sales taxes and charge backs deducted)?

Response: The proposed Management Fee shall be in the form of a percentage of gross receipts realized by the collection of parking revenue at the AIRPORT on an annual basis.

Question 10: RFP page 14, Section 1.9: Indicates that that Management Fee percentages may be subject to annual discussion, rather than set in stone, to reflect the realities of the Airport's financial position. What is the consequence if the annual discussion/renegotiation fails to achieve a management fee adjustment satisfactory to both parties? Would each party have a right to terminate the agreement under such circumstances?

Response: The language in Section 1.9 is intended to clarify that the City is willing to collaborate with the Contractor in the face of a potentially catastrophic event that causes significant reduction in enplanements.

Question 11: Will Contractor have a right to call for a renegotiation of the management fee when gross receipts are reduced for reasons outside of Contractor's reasonable control, such that the Contractor's management fee is insufficient to cover Contractor's costs? Reasons outside of parking operator's control would include reduced enplanements, pandemic lockdowns and opening of off-site parking competition.

Response: Please see the response to questions 10 above.

Question 12: Is there both an ACDBE goal and DBE goal? If there is DBE participation required by the Contractors, please state the amount?

Response: No.

Question 13: Section 3.21(a) in the Sample Agreement: Indicates that the Performance Bond = 100% of the proposed annual management fee. Because the annual management fee is based on a percentage of gross receipts, in order to determine the size of the performance bond required, the amount of annual revenues is needed, yet that amount won't be known until the year is over. Will the bond size/amount be based on projected gross receipts or based on the prior year's actual gross receipts or other?

Response: As part of the rates and charges negotiations with the airlines, the Airport is required to provide a future forecast of costs and future cost per enplanement. This negotiation typically takes place in the Spring of each year and sets the rates and charges for the airlines for the following year. After this negotiation is completed, the Airport will provide the Management company an estimate of enplanements for the forthcoming fiscal year that can then be used to collaboratively develop the anticipated parking revenues and subsequent Management Fee.

Question 14: Please provide the actual credit card fees for the most recent 12-month period?

Response: Actual credit card fees from March 2021 – February 2022 is \$188,384.57.

Question 15: Please provide the percentage of receipts paid by credit card for the most recent 12-month period.

Response: 93.24%

Question 16: The RFP requires that Contractor to provide a parking guidance system to guide guests to open parking spaces. Should proposers include the cost of a complete parking guidance system with red/green light indicators for every covered parking space or a less costly signage package simply providing the number of open parking spaces by level? As there is a significant price difference between the 2 options, it would be helpful to understand the City's desire.

Response: It is the intent of the City to implement a red/green light guidance system.