

ADDENDUM NO. TWO

REQUEST FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST (RFEI)

BROADBAND INVESTMENT & NETWORK EXPANSION PARTNERSHIP

PROJECT NO. 21-85

CITY OF THORNTON, CO

TO: Prospective Proposing Firms and all others concerned

DATE: February 22, 2023

PURPOSE: To provide additional information and clarification to the solicitation documents for the above-referenced Project.

1. The following questions and answers are provided for additional clarification to the RFEI:

Question 1: Is the RFEI process only for those who are wanting to seek funding from the City to build a fiber network?

Answer 1: No, Thornton is seeking partnership opportunities that could come in many forms. Any firm seeking to partner with Thornton on permitting, use of infrastructure, funding (including grants), or otherwise should submit a response to this RFEI for Thornton's consideration.

Question 2: If we are not seeking funding to build out the network, do we need to still go through the RFEI process or can we do a traditional process of securing a franchise agreement with Thornton?

Answer 2: Thornton does not anticipate entering into any franchise agreements for broadband services outside of this RFEI process. Firms that do not respond to this RFEI are expected to follow the typical ROW permitting process.

Question 3: Is it possible for Thornton to provide .shp files for city-owned infrastructure?

Answer 3: .SHP files are not available at this time. Selected provider(s) will be provided access to information at future date.

Question 4: For existing runs that have spare conduit and fiber capacity, what does the capacity look like for each one? What room is left in the 2"/3" duct and how many spare fibers are available?

Answer 4: While Thornton does maintain spare capacity in its conduit and fiber cables, it does not currently utilize a fiber management tool and the spare duct space has not been proofed, nor the dark fiber tested. Prior to completion of negotiations with a private sector partner, the exact condition and usability of these assets will need to be determined and documented to maximize their value to both parties.

Question 5: Is the proposed city-wide ring still planned to be completed by Thornton? Or will it get completed by the partner ISP?

Answer 5: A portion of the city fiber ring is complete as indicated in the maps provided. The additional proposed infrastructure is not currently budgeted for, but it is a future goal. Our hope is that a partnership resulting from this RFEI process will help facilitate the completion of the loop. The specific terms and conditions associated with that completion are open to negotiation with the most favorable proposed solution likely to be selected for entering into a partnership agreement.

Question 6: When it is mentioned to have 100% fiber to the home, would we be able to exclude areas of Thornton that already have fiber?

Answer 6: There are no preset conditions with this RFEI. The goal is to provide high quality, ubiquitous broadband services throughout the community. The firm with the most advantageous proposal to achieve that goal is expected to be selected to partner with Thornton.

Question 7: If we provide a proposal to the RFEI, are we obligated to provide services to Thornton or would there be a period of negotiation prior to a signed agreement prior to any obligation of services?

Answer 7: As stated in the RFEI documents, responding to the RFEI does not obligate Thornton or potential providers. Thornton fully expects some negotiations to solidify a partnership.

Question 8: We provide business and wholesale services, but not residential services. Will Thornton still entertain a response from our firm or is Thornton only interested in responses that meet all of your objectives?

Answer 8: The purpose of this RFEI is to find a partner that will provide broadband services to the home and/or to businesses. Submittals presented that don't meet that objective are not expected to be selected for a partnership agreement, but that does not necessarily preclude submission.

Question 9: Will Thornton be limiting solutions in broadband connection to fiber only? Or will alternative broadband and 5G solutions, such as CBRS, be considered?

Answer 9: This RFEI is oriented towards long-term solutions that provide symmetrical gigabit connectivity. Thornton may consider having exploratory conversations regarding alternative technologies with companies that can demonstrate successful implementations. If these technologies are considered, their deployment would be on a limited scale and in areas where symmetrical gigabit solutions are not practically or economically feasible.

Question 10: We understand that Thornton is currently evaluating a dig-once policy. Please describe your planned dig-once policy and explain how Thornton envisions it applying to the proposed RFEI project. Would Thornton consider exempting the awarded project from dig-once requirements?

Answer 10: Thornton is working on a Dig Once revision to Chapter 2, Article VII, Rights-of-Way Management. This ordinance will be scheduled for consideration by City Council in the upcoming months. If, adopted by City Council the Dig Once policy will result in additional city owned empty conduit be placed at the time of open trench excavation or utility boring. This policy will require notice to the city of installation from private entities installing telecom, cable, or utility infrastructure, provide notification of conduit to be placed, allowing local government or other parties the option to have additional [up to two (2)] conduit installed along arterial and collector roadways.

As previously stated, a goal of this RFEI (among others) is to provide high quality gigabit level service at affordable rates to Thornton residents and businesses. If exemption from the dig-once policy would improve the ability of a partner to achieve the goals of this RFEI, that is something respondents should indicate in their proposals so Thornton may consider that condition.

Question 11: City Code 2-272(a)(1)c and 2-272(a)(1)e both provide high level guidance pertaining to permitting and mapping requirements. Does the city have a permit submission checklist or standards document that may provide additional detail on the required elements?

Answer 11: Thornton does not currently have a checklist. Additional permit information can be found here:

<https://www.thorntonco.gov/government/infrastructure/engineering/Pages/Permit-Information.aspx>

https://www.thorntonco.gov/government/infrastructure/engineering/Documents/ROW_Permit_FAQ.pdf

Question 12: Does the city have a list of facilities available for colocation of carrier equipment such as routers, switches, patch-panels, and other electronics? If so, please provide details as to their location, amount of space available, power and cooling capacity, and confirm if access would be available 24x7?

Answer 12: Thornton is open to discuss optimal locations for colocation sites with the selected partner that may include being on Thornton owned property.

Question 13: How does the city presently manage their fiber, conduit and colocation assets? Does Thornton utilize a third party or manage the process yourselves? How are moves, adds, and changes managed?

Answer 13: Thornton manages our fiber and conduit through internal process and documents. Thornton does not have a fiber asset management system in place today. Colocation is minimal and consists of other local government assets. Thornton is open to considering options for other management tools and processes.

Question 14: As a Vendor, we leverage several underground methods to professionally and quickly build out our network to serve residents. This includes Micro-Trenching (MT) in some neighborhoods, as MT is conducive for navigating around heavily populated rights-of-ways or aerial plant, which is sometimes the case in older neighborhoods. Does the city have a point of view on the use of Micro-Trenching that can be shared?

Answer 14: Thornton is aware of the micro-trenching installation method. No methods have been ruled out. Proposals should include information on the installation means and methods for consideration.

2. All other terms and conditions shall remain unchanged except as provided by this Addendum. Proposing firms must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in their Proposal.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. TWO

Megan deGrood, CPPB
Purchasing Manager

Date