

Revenue (neither proposal assumes use of existing furniture)

- O-D
 - MAG \$110 million (does not include \$6 MM up-front payment)
 - City Revenue Share 35% at low tier; 50% at high tier
 - 10-year revenue estimate \$447 MM (verified as realistic based on proposed inventory)
 - Estimated 10-year revenue to City \$157 MM
- T-V
 - MAG \$90 million (does not include \$6 MM up-front payment)
 - City Revenue Share 60.5% base; options to increase to 64.4%
 - 10-year revenue estimate \$639 MM (verified as realistic based on proposed inventory)
 - Estimated 10-year revenue to City \$387 MM
- Difference
 - \$20 million more guaranteed by O-D
 - \$230 million greater potential by T-V

Proposed inventory at BAFO

- O-D
 - 4500 shelter & shade
 - 3161 (trash receptacles, interactive & vending kiosks, urban panels, elockers)
 - Real time information at 815 locations; shared space with advertising at 810 of those
- T-V
 - 3000 shelters; City negotiated for additional 450 shade structures
 - 3339 (trash receptacles, wayfinding kiosks, urban panels, elockers, scooter docks)
 - Real time information at 3000 locations on dedicated screens

CAPEX

- O-D
 - Paid by City \$111.5 million (costs not included and to be negotiated: expanded amenities- types and quantities, Community Outreach, site costs est. +\$75 MM)
 - Offsets to CAPEX paid by O-D total \$4.4 million (sunshades and toilet maint.)
- T-V
 - Paid by City \$237 million

Advertising

- O-D
 - Static faces 864
 - Digital faces 810
- T-V
 - Static faces 4592

- Digital faces 1952

O-D Claims

1. T-V would use existing street furniture
 - a. False – T-V did not assume in its original proposal or BAFO revenue from existing street furniture
2. O-D has contractual right to generate revenue and did not include so no competitive advantage.
 - a. False – No one has a contractual right free of financial obligation to generate revenue from existing street furniture. ALL bidders were prohibited from assuming revenue from existing street furniture.
3. There are no financial risks for City under O-D proposal
 - a. False – O-D submitted a BAFO with a scenario where City pays 100% CAPEX. O-D's proposal looks sustainable based solely on MAG because some costs were not yet included and left for negotiation. In their scenario provided in their original proposal where they privately pay for the investment, the City receives no MAG and no revenue share during the 10-year initial term. *(note: O-D did offer a revenue share at a second tier of Gross Revenue earnings, but based on their revenue projections and their project references, the evaluation committee assumed only the first tier was achievable which was at a rate of 0% share to the City.)*
4. T-V ignored a critical public health and safety issue by not proposing any toilets.
 - a. False – the RFP stated that toilets were not a requirement for proposals. Additionally, only O-D offered toilets that already exist and are owned by them.
5. O-D proposed significantly fewer ad panels.
 - a. True – this plays a role in the \$200 million difference in revenue estimates and greater potential for program amenities and financial benefits to City from T-V's proposal.
6. O-D offered 30% more bus stop amenities.
 - a. True – however it was 20% more not 30%. The mix of amenities varied between the two bidders; ex. O-D offered 1500 sunshades at no cost to City, T-V offered dedicated real time information at every shelter location (3000).