

Request for Proposals
North Texas Providers Of Services To UAM (PSUS) And Uncrewed Traffic Management
(UTM) Service Providers Regional Integration Pilot Program Phase Two

Questions and Responses

Question #1: Please provide budget template.

Response: Please see the budget template that has been uploaded to the procurement webpage.

Question #2: In Partner Criteria #3, please clarify which data feeds are relevant.

Response: The relevant data feeds are as follows:

1. Advisories published
2. Flight plans
3. Local event information
4. Any other data that can be shared that will improve the safety of the airspace

Question #3: Has NCTCOG obtained commitment to collaborate from the Dallas UTM Key Site? And if so, what kind of collaboration or project is the Key Site looking to implement as part of this project?

Response: NCTCOG has not yet obtained commitment from the Dallas UTM Key Site partners. The key site received funding for a duration of one year, during the pilot we will need to find another mechanism in which to add value to operators in the region.

Question #4: One of the deliverables is "Marketing and Outreach Summary" – marketing and outreach is not mentioned as one of the tasks. What participation does NCTCOG expect of the vendor for this deliverable?

Response: Vendors will engage in outreach activities to our city governments and drone users in the region as a part of this effort. Vendors will be expected to prepare presentations for these sessions. The outreach will happen virtually via the North Texas UAS Safety and Integration Task Force and Two other workshops during the year. No travel will be required.

Question #5: What is the expected time commitment of the vendor to participate in research activities? What kind of research is NCTCOG looking to engage in for this project?

Response: This element will have to be funded by another mechanism. It includes the use of universities to conduct any research, surveys, etc. that we will need to ensure success with the pilot. Please consider this to be an optional element.

Question #6: Page 2, First Paragraph, Line 4 references “at no cost to NCTCOG” which seems to be in conflict with the budget provisions – should we assume this is a typographical error?

Response: This statement has been removed from the RFP. Please review the revised RFP for updates.

Question #7: Page 3, First Paragraph, Line 2 references “Positioning Service Units (PSUs)” – do you mean to refer to “Providers of Services for UAM (PSUs)”?

Response: This has been updated in the revised RFP and should now read as “Providers of Services for UAS”

Question #8: Page 8 – Opening of Proposals – appears to be scheduled (May 30) prior to the submission date (June 6) of the proposals. Please clarify the correct date(s) for submission and opening of proposals.

Response: The public opening of proposals will occur on June 6, 2025. Please review the revised RFP for updates.

Question #9: Contract Execution –Given the pause between Phase 1 and Phase 2, would it be possible to accelerate the date for targeted contract award? Would NCTCOG consider providing a “Notice to Proceed” prior to finalizing contracting?

Response: Due to NCTCOG’s standard process, Board approval must be received prior to proceeding with Contract execution.

Question #10: The RFP notes that the bidders should scope-to-cost at \$75,000 but does not note a period of performance. Page 6 describes an overall project budget of \$400,000 over two years and the Project Schedule notes two years to completion. Is the expectation that we would scope to \$75,000 / year for two years? Or that we would scope to \$75,000 total for the project?

Response: This is correct, there is a maximum amount of \$150,000 over the two years at \$75,000 per contract year.

Question #11: If the expectation is that total project cost for the contractor is limited to \$75,000, would it be acceptable to propose a 12-month period of performance for the work under a two-year contract with an option for extension/renewal at 12 months based on lessons learned and mutual agreement? Or is the contractor expected to propose a 2-year scope?

Response: Yes, it is acceptable to propose a 12-month period of performance for the work under a two-year contract with an option for extension/renewal at 12 months based on lessons learned and mutual agreement.