

1. Will this “opportunity for a multi-provider access communications infrastructure” be awarded to a single successful bidder OR to potentially multiple successful bidders?

The NPS reserves the right to select the proposal(s) that, in NPS’s judgment, best meets the public interest and the objectives of the Implementation Plan, including minimizing impacts to the Park settings while achieving the capacity objective. The NPS may select a single participant or multiple participants, at its discretion, based on what best meets public interest and Telecommunications Plan objectives.

2. Will NPS accept proposals for a single sub-area (or potentially multiple sub-areas), in lieu of a comprehensive plan encompassing all 5 sub-areas? In other words, is NPS open to carving up the development area into multiple providers/winning proposals?

The Opportunity does not require that a proposal encompasses all sub-areas. Proposals are evaluated for consistency with the Telecommunications Plan, implementation feasibility, and minimization of impacts, including node count, visual effects, and co-location strategies. While the Opportunity identifies an overall development area, the NPS retains discretion to select proposals that best meet plan objectives, which may include limited or phased coverage, provided the proposal demonstrates Telecommunications Plan consistency and meets all Minimum Requirements. The NPS also reserves the right to select multiple participants, which could result in multiple providers operating in different sub-areas.

3. Who will have ownership of any new or replacement poles installed in connection with the project?

Any infrastructure installed under this Opportunity would be authorized through a revocable, non-exclusive Right-of-Way (ROW) permit. The ROW Permit constitutes a license to use or occupy NPS lands; it does not convey a property interest. Ownership, control, removal, and restoration obligations are governed by the terms and conditions of the ROW Permit, including performance bond and decommissioning requirements. Infrastructure must be removed and sites restored upon permit termination, unless otherwise authorized by NPS.

4. Will the winning bidder bear all costs for the project design and buildout or will NPS and/or other government sources be providing any funding in connection with the project? If so, how much and for what purpose(s)?

The successful participant(s) will be responsible for all costs associated with proposal development, design, permitting, compliance, construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of the infrastructure. The Opportunity states that participants are responsible for cost recovery associated with ROW permit processing, including NEPA, NHPA, National Capital Planning Commission, and Commission of Fine Arts reviews. The Opportunity does not identify any NPS or other government funding for project design or buildout.

5. Will government stakeholders (i.e. Federal, District of Columbia) have any priority access rights (over other private attachers) to the infrastructure?

The ROW Permit requires that permittees provide space for co-locators in accordance with the Telecommunications Plan. While permittees may charge reasonable rent and may not impose unreasonable restrictions, the RFP does not establish priority access rights for government stakeholders over other eligible co-locators. Any access or occupancy would be subject to separate ROW permits and applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

6. Are there any circumstances under which time extensions will be granted for proposal submissions?

Unsure – no request for extension have been received. Request for time extensions need to come in writing to the NPS.

7. Will this “opportunity for a multi-provider access communications infrastructure” be awarded to a single successful bidder OR to potentially multiple successful bidders?

The NPS reserves the right to select the proposal(s) that, in NPS’s judgment, best meets the public interest and the objectives of the Implementation Plan, including minimizing impacts to the Park settings while achieving the capacity objective. The NPS may select a single participant or multiple participants, at its discretion, based on what best meets public interest and Telecommunications Plan objectives.

8. Will NPS accept proposals for a single sub-area (or potentially multiple sub-areas), in lieu of a comprehensive plan encompassing all 5 sub-areas? In other words, is NPS open to carving up the development area into multiple providers/winning proposals?

The Opportunity does not require that a proposal encompasses all sub-areas. Proposals are evaluated for consistency with the Telecommunications Plan, implementation feasibility, and minimization of impacts, including node count, visual effects, and co-location strategies. While the Opportunity identifies an overall development area, the NPS retains discretion to select proposals that best meet plan objectives, which may include limited or phased coverage, provided the proposal demonstrates Telecommunications Plan consistency and meets all Minimum Requirements. The NPS also reserves the right to select multiple participants, which could result in multiple providers operating in different sub-areas.

9. Who will have ownership of any new or replacement poles installed in connection with the project?

Any infrastructure installed under this Opportunity would be authorized through a revocable, non-exclusive Right-of-Way (ROW) permit. The ROW Permit constitutes a license to use or occupy NPS lands; it does not convey a property interest. Ownership, control, removal, and restoration obligations are governed by the terms and conditions of the ROW Permit, including performance bond and decommissioning requirements. Infrastructure must be removed and sites restored upon permit termination, unless otherwise authorized by NPS.

10. Will the winning bidder bear all costs for the project design and buildout or will NPS and/or other government sources be providing any funding in connection with the project? If so, how much and for what purpose(s)?

The successful participant(s) will be responsible for all costs associated with proposal development, design, permitting, compliance, construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of the infrastructure. The Opportunity states that participants are responsible for cost recovery associated with ROW permit processing, including NEPA, NHPA, National Capital Planning Commission, and Commission of Fine Arts reviews. The Opportunity does not identify any NPS or other government funding for project design or buildout.

11. Will NPS provide a summary of the Public Comments they received regarding the Telecommunications Plan?

No – the final plan represents how the NPS responded to comments received.

12. Will the NPS consider extending this deadline for the RFP?

Unsure – no request for extension have been received. Request for time extensions need to come in writing to the NPS.

13. Does NPS expect Pepco and Verizon Landline to provide utilities to each location?

Power and fiber extensions are an anticipated and necessary part of implementation. Participants are responsible for planning and coordinating how power and fiber will be brought to the proposed sites, working with local utility providers (which may include Pepco and Verizon, or other equivalent providers), and must include those utility-connection details in the proposal.

14. Can NPS explain the relationship between the NPS Telecommunications Plan and the D.C. Small Cell Design Guidelines?

In this Opportunity, the NPS is treating them as companion design frameworks. The NPS Telecommunications Plan sets the what, where, and limits for infrastructure on NPS land; the D.C. Small Cell Design Guidelines provide design guidance and best practices that help inform how proposals are executed—but NPS standards control. The Opportunity states that “proposed infrastructure must be consistent with” both the Telecommunications Plan and the Small Cell Design Guidelines.

- The NPS Telecommunications Infrastructure Concept Plan (Telecommunications Plan) is the park-specific, NPS-driven concept that sets the objectives and constraints for NPS lands—e.g., the 5x capacity goal, minimizing adverse impacts (especially to cultural resources), avoiding/limiting changes to contributing features (including views/structures/lighting), preferring use of non-contributing features, and standardizing/siting practices to reduce maintenance.
- The D.C. Small Cell Design Guidelines (March 21, 2019) are an additional, applicable design guideline set that proposals must also be consistent with.

The NPS is using the Telecommunications Plan to define the NPS acceptability framework (resource protection + siting/typology intent), while the D.C. Small Cell Design Guidelines help shape the small-cell form factor and visual/streetscape compatibility expectations—reflected in evaluation preferences for nodes that match or reproduce existing architectural elements (e.g., light poles/lighting standards) and blend into the setting.

15. The RFP highlights some information being required as part of the Implementation Plan, the “Required content for each proposed node” which includes the requirement in Section 6.2.B, bullet point #6, Capacity (per node and system-wide) - Proposals should include a statement by each applicable carrier that the design supports a 5x or more increase in carrier capacity for the proposed area....And again in section 8.2, bullet # 3, Capacity Certification. The proposal includes statements from each Carrier confirming that the proposed design supports the required capacity objective (e.g., 5x increase) for the proposed area. Why is this required if the Environmental Assessment already deemed that their suggested design cares for 5X for each Carrier at all suggested node locations?

The Telecommunications Plan establishes that a conceptual minimum build-out framework can support a 5x capacity increase, but it does not certify that any specific proposer’s design—or any individual carrier’s implementation—will actually achieve that performance. The carrier capacity statements are required to close that gap. These requirements are complementary—not duplicative—and are necessary to move responsibly from planning to implementation.

Because performance depends on carrier-specific spectrum, radios, loading assumptions, and co-location realities, the NPS cannot rely solely on the EA’s generalized conclusions. The NPS

needs carrier confirmation that *your* exact node count/topology/siting and RF design achieves the performance objective.

What the Opportunity is doing with the carrier statements is:

- Validate your specific design, not the concept. The Implementation Plan must document capacity “per node and system-wide,” and the NPS requires “a statement by each applicable carrier that the design supports a 5x or more increase ... for the proposed area,” plus a demonstration of expected capacity/coverage performance.
- Make capacity a responsiveness gate (pass/fail). “Capacity Certification” is a Minimum Requirement—if a proposal lacks carrier confirmation, it can be found non-responsive and removed from scoring.
- Account for proposal variation and avoid “overbuilding.” Proposals may change node quantities, typologies, co-location assumptions, or locations (including limited deviations), and NPS explicitly expects you to address coordination with existing/proposed rooftop macro sites and ongoing use of COWs/COLTs—all of which can affect whether 5x is achieved and whether the solution is the least-impactful way to do it.
- Confirm carrier buy-in. NPS can’t certify a carrier’s network design or commit a carrier to use the system. Requiring a carrier statement reduces the risk of selecting/building infrastructure that *looks compliant* but won’t be adopted or won’t deliver the promised capacity.

The Plan supports the *feasibility* of achieving 5x under the plan concept, but the Opportunity requires carrier certification because NPS is evaluating and selecting among competing, proposal-specific designs, and must ensure the chosen design actually delivers the 5x objective and does so in the least-impactful manner on NPS lands.

16. Have any Carriers expressed reservations or concerns that the EA or “Minimum Buildout” does not achieve 5X?

No. The Telecommunications Plan was distributed to carriers for their review and, based on the record reflected in the EA, Telecommunications Plan, and the Opportunity, the NPS is not aware of any carriers having expressed reservations or concerns that the Plan or the Minimum Build-Out Study fails to achieve the 5x capacity objective.

17. If the primary goal of the Telecommunications Plan is to achieve 5X Capacity on the National Mall, why is the weighted valuation of the Implementation Plan rated the lowest of the criteria at 5 points?

Because “5x capacity” is treated as a threshold requirement, not the primary differentiator once proposals are deemed responsive.

- Capacity is a Minimum Requirement (pass/fail). To be eligible for scoring at all, a proposal must include carrier statements confirming the design supports the required

National Park Service
Telecommunications Opportunity – Questions and Responses
January 27, 2026

capacity objective (e.g., 5x). If you can't demonstrate/certify 5x, you can be found non-responsive and removed from consideration.

- Once proposals clear that threshold, NPS is using the 80-point Implementation Plan category to differentiate solutions primarily on how they achieve 5x while minimizing impacts—especially by reducing site count (15 pts), co-location (10 pts), scale (15 pts), architecture/aesthetic integration (15 pts), and location/viewshed compatibility (15 pts).
- The Capacity/Performance Approach sub-criterion is therefore only 5 points because NPS is focused on whether performance is achieved “without exceeding the minimum necessary infrastructure” (i.e., avoiding overbuilding), rather than rewarding higher capacity as the dominant scoring advantage.
- This tracks the Telecommunications Plan's standards: enable the 5x goal while minimizing adverse impacts, avoiding/limiting changes to contributing cultural resources, and preferring fewer sites where appropriate.
- NPS also states it may select the proposal that best serves the public interest by minimizing impacts while achieving the capacity objective—again signaling that “5x” is the baseline and “least impact” is the competition space.

18. When does NPS anticipate selection of Participant(s)?

The NPS anticipates selecting Participants sometime after the February 16, 2026 proposal deadline, following completion of the evaluation process, but no specific selection date has been committed in the Opportunity.

19. Once selected to participate in the Opportunity is it expected final designs will be reviewed/approved by SHPO, CFA and NCPC prior to issuance of NPS ROW and Special Use Permits?

Yes

20. Have we been able to establish the fiber links for various sites that the DC Fire and Emergency Medical Services (DC FEMS) usually stand-up apparatus for Special Events?

The NPS has not established permanent fiber links to the temporary sites DC FEMS typically uses for special events. Those locations remain supported through temporary telecommunications deployments, supplemented—but not replaced—by the improved baseline capacity envisioned in the Telecommunications Plan.