OHIO TURNPIKE AND
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION

ADDENDUM NO. 3
ISSUED OCTOBER 3, 2025

to

RFP NO. 22-2025
TO SELECT A FIRM TO PERFORM CELL TOWER LICENSE BROKERAGE AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SERVICES WITH THE OPTION TO PERFORM BROKERAGE AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR THE COMMISSION'S EXISTING AND PROSPECTIVE FIBER OPTIC LINE AGREEMENTS

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: 5:00 P.M. (EASTERN TIME) OCTOBER 14, 2025

ATTENTION OF RESPONDENTS IS DIRECTED TO:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED THROUGH 5:00 PM ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

Issued by the Ohio Turnpike and Infrastructure Commission through Aimee W. Lane, Esq, Director of Contracts Administration.

Aimee W. Lane

Aimee W. Lane, Esq.,
Director of Contracts Administration

October 3, 2025
Date

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED THROUGH 5:00 P.M. ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

Q#1 In Appendix A, could the Commission clarify its definition of "property management services" as it relates to this RFP? Specifically, should responses interpret this in terms of facilities management, or is the expectation more narrowly focused on administrative and contract management functions?

A#1 Property management services would mean administrative and contract management functions. The Commission has Engineering and Maintenance staff that performs facilities management for the 34 Commission owned towers. For the other 8 towers located on Commission property, the companies owning those towers are responsible for facilities management.

Q#2 The RFP indicates that responses may bid on either Item 1 or Item II. Could the Commission confirm whether submitting a proposal for only a portion of the services will affect the proposal's competitiveness?

A#2 Responses should be for either Item 1 or Item II. Partial responses will not be considered.

Q#3 Can the Commission confirm whether the current provider of tower brokerage and management services intends to submit a response to this RFP?

A#3 No. The Commission is required to use a competitive proposal process to procure these brokerage and management services. Any and all interested respondents are invited to submit a proposal. The Commission has no way of knowing which interested respondents will submit a proposal until a proposal is submitted.

Q#4 Current Marketing / Monetization - Is there an active effort to market the Commission's tower sites through a third-party? If so, what has the experience been to date?

A#4 The Commission has utilized a communications tower broker manager since 2015 with active efforts to market the Commission's tower sites and plans to continue to do so under any future Broker agreements. To date, the Commission's experience has been satisfactory.

Q#5 Will existing arrangements be terminated upon award of this contract? Will termination apply to both existing and new sites?

A#5 Existing arrangements will be continued under the new contract pursuant to the terms of those agreements.

Q#6 Has the Commission explored opportunities to monetize or restructure existing tower leases?

A#6 Yes.

Q#7 To the extent possible, would the Commission be able to share a recent summary of revenue generated from existing tower sites?

A#7 The Commission anticipates providing this information to the awarded Broker.

Q#8 Has the Commission experienced any maintenance or structural issues with the existing tower sites?

A#8 The inspected towers are generally in good condition with only minor deficiencies.

Q#9 How are existing tower facilities currently monitored and maintained?

A#9 The OTIC inspects each tower once every five (5) years in accordance with Telecommunications Industry Association Standards (TIA-222-G and TIA-222-H).

Q#10 How many existing sites were developed directly with carriers versus through a broker arrangement?

A#10 Prior to 2015, all co-locations were developed directly with carriers; since 2015, all co-locations were developed through the communications tower broker and manager.

Q#11 For the Tower License agreement, will the Commission consider alternative compensation models?

A#11 Respondents must include a completed Revenue Sharing/Pricing Proposal (Appendix B), but in addition, may offer alternative compensation models.

Q#12 In section 3.5, it indicates the broker will have the first right to construct new towers. Could the Commission clarify how this right will be applied?

A#12 It is anticipated that this "first right" would be as between the broker and manager and any other party interested in building a New Tower (as defined in the agreement).

Q#13 It appears there may be a significant amount of work related to management of existing Licenses. Would the Commission consider a rev share on existing Leases?

A#13 No. See Section 5.2 Existing Licenses, in the Contract attached as Exhibit C to the Request for Proposals.

Q#14 Can the Commission share relevant detail (dollar amounts, escalation, time remaining on current term and ultimate expiration) for existing agreements referenced in Appendix A that would be transferred to the winning respondent if ultimately selected to contract with the Commission as the Brokerage and Property Manager?

A#14 Please see A#7.

Q#15 Once the Commission has selected a respondent, and assuming that respondent enter into an agreement to become the new Brokerage and Property Manager, what role does the Commission anticipate it will have in these agreements going forward? Is there a predetermined process for new Licenses to be reviewed and approved?

A#15 It is anticipated that Commission staff will meet periodically with the new brokerage and property manager, and that it will review and approve of any new licenses prior to them being executed.

Q#16 Will the Commission provide a point of contact with which the Brokerage and Property manager will work to approve deals negotiated under the terms of the management contract?

A#16 Yes. The Commission will provide a point of contact to the awarded broker at the time of contract award.

Q#17 Are the Existing Fiber License Agreements set up as IRU agreements or dark fiber lease agreements?

A#17 The existing Fiber License Agreements are for use of the Commission's right of way.

Q#18 Could you confirm whether [Current Broker] is a private third party?

A#18 The current broker is a private third party.

Q#19 Have any towers been constructed on these leased sites, or is [Current Broker] simply controlling the lease areas without physical infrastructure?

A#19 The current broker has constructed towers at two locations.

Q#20 If no towers have been built, do the lease agreements allow for termination due to non-performance or lack of development?

A#20 N/A

Q#21 For [Current Broker] locations with ground leases do towers exist, are there any co-locations currently in place?

A#21 Yes.

Q#22 Regarding license rights: who currently holds them for these tower locations? Is it [Current Broker], and if so, is this the same entity referenced earlier in the addendum? If not, could you clarify who holds those rights?

A#22 The Commission holds all rights associated with its owned towers.

Q#23 Do the lease agreements provide the Commission with the ability to terminate for non-performance, either with [Current Broker] or any other third party involved and controlling the ground?

A#23 The terms of the individual lease agreements can vary; however, generally, such agreements are only between the Commission and the Licensee / Lessee.

Q#24 Did [Current Broker] receive these rights through a previously awarded RFP? If so, would it be possible to obtain a copy of that issued/awarded RFP for reference?

A#24 The last RFP for this service was issued in 2020. Information regarding that RFP can be found on the Commission's website - https://www.ohioturnpike.org/docs/default-source/procurement/ntb-final---hv---rfp-no-3---2020---tower-lease-brokerage-and-management-services.pdf?sfvrsn=d975ebc4_0

To request a copy of the 2020 RFP, please submit a public records request to recordsrequest@ohioturnpike.org.

Q#25 Will the consultant selected under this RFP be responsible for marketing and leasing of these third-party towers listed under [Current Broker]?

A#25 Yes.

Q#26 Will a "reviewed GAAP financial statements and accompanying supplementary information performed and provided by a independent and well-established CPA firm" suffice in lieu of an *audited financial statement* for Technical Proposal Requirement item C?

A#26 Respondents must demonstrate sufficient financial stability to perform the services described in this RFP. Reviewed financial statements, prepared by an independent CPA and dated within the past 12 months, are required at a minimum.

Q#27 Regarding the Revenue Sharing / Price Proposal: Is it solely the percentage of revenue being shared? or the overall value (share percentage X projected revenue)?

A#27 Respondents should state the percentage of revenue being shared when completing Appendix B, Revenue Sharing/Pricing Proposal Percentage.

Q#28 What sort of review and/or approval process is necessary by the Commission regarding applied for tower space, ground space, power sharing, structural modifications of the tower, etc.? If yes, what is the expected timeline for these submittals, hearings and decisions?

A#28 The review and/or approval process, as well as the expected timeline, is typically on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature and location of the request.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 3