City of Sherwood Fiber to the Home (FTTH) Design Services

DATE October 20, 2020 BID ADDENDUM NO. 2

Addition/Change to the Contract Documents

The work provided for in this addendum shall become a part of the drawings and specifications for this project.

Clarifications to Submitted Questions

Question #1: Does the project scope include engineering design for all remaining premises in the City?

Response: The goal is to eventually serve every address in Sherwood (business and residential). The scope of this project is just the residential tax lots but we'd like the design to account for serving other commercial locations when being passed by the backbone/distribution cable. This can be done by making sure vault, cabinets, and/or splice cases are located in such a way that lends itself to future extensions.

Question #2: Could you please provide us with a total number of premises or households/businesses to pass in the project?

Response: The total addresses in town is 7,859 that includes business and residential. The scope of this project is to only serve the residential tax lots which we estimate at 6,000.

Question #3: Can the Deliverable be a GDB/Shape File and PDF rather than a AutoCAD file?

Response: A GIS/Shape file along with a PDF will be acceptable.

Question #4: Will the new network be utilizing any of the City's existing network?

Response: Yes, In many cases we'll need to upsize the cable on our existing routes. It can be assumed that the physical path is usable but the cable may need to be replaced depending on the required fiber counts.

Question #5: What SUE level of utility collection is required, if any?

Response: A section detail for perpendicular crossings of "mainline" conduits and existing underground public infrastructure will be required to minimize possible crossing conflicts and damage. Longitudinal profiles of new mainline conduit facilities will not be required.

Question #6: How does the City of Sherwood plan to delineate permits (by area of network expansion, or blanket)?

Response: Within the City limits, a blanket ROW permit will be issued by the City. For areas outside the City limits, obtaining ROW or facility permits from the jurisdictional agency covering those areas will be required.

Question #7: Is there enough spare capacity in the existing fiber to assume its use for integrating it into a new citywide fiber backbone ring, or should our new design assume creation of a completely new backbone ring.

Addendum Number 2 Page 1 of 5

Response: In many cases we'll need to upsize the cable on our existing routes. It can be assumed that the physical path is usable but the cable may need to be replaced depending on the required fiber counts.

Question #8: If backbone needs to be designed, does it need to encompass the entire city or just take into consideration residential FTTH areas?

Response: If new backbone sections need to be designed it should include additional capacity for growth.

Question #9: Does Sherwood have any existing construction standards for fiber installation, or do they need to be established and included in the special specifications deliverable?

Response: Yes we do but we expect revision will be made per this project.

Question #10: Does Sherwood have any manufacturer preference for cables, cabinets, splice cases, vaults, etc? if so can you share those preferences?

Response: None at this time

Question #11: Can you confirm if the design needs to include traffic control plans? If so, do they need to be site specific or can standard DOT indexes be provided?

Response: A standardized traffic control plan detail meeting MUTCD standards (as modified by ODOT), will be included in the project plans for those project areas where standardized lane closures are required. For locations where more complex traffic control is anticipated, a specific traffic control plan for that area may be required.

Question #12: Do we need to assume any aerial pole loading, pole attachment agreements, make ready coordination, or is this strictly an underground design?

Response: We have pole attachment agreements but have a requirement in the city that all new construction be placed underground. If we need to overbuild an existing aerial route we can do that. In those cases pole loading/permit requirement will need to be taken into account.

Question #13: Do any profile detail drawings need to be included for road crossings?

Response: A section detail for "perpendicular" crossings of "mainline" conduit and existing underground public infrastructure will be required to minimize possible crossing conflicts and damage. Longitudinal profiles of new facilities will not be required.

Question #14: What is the plan for construction support? There are currently no services indicated to support the contractors with responding to RFI's, shop drawing review/approval, construction inspections, etc?

Response: Construction support will be handled (if needed) by a separate contract issued at the time of construction.

Question #15: What is the permit process for special crossings, such as railroads, DOT, etc.? Will the engineer have to engage any 3rd party entities besides the city during the design process?

Response: Yes, we expect the engineer to engage with all 3rd party permit aututhorites and obtain necessary permits

Question #16: Does city of Sherwood have an existing GIS data structure?

Addendum Number 2 Page 2 of 5

Response: We do have GIS and use the 3-GIS for our fiber asset management. It's unknown if our fiber asset management system has a data structure that can be shared.

Question #17: Page 2, ORS 279A 120 (1) - gives preference to instate bidders. Item (2)(b) allows for a percent increase to the bid of the nonresident bidder equal to the percent, if any, of the preference given to the bidder in the state which the bidder resides. Bidder is incorporated in Missouri and bid will originate from Minnesota. What percentage increase to our bid will this be?

Response: These bidding requirements are generally applicable only on construction contracts where BOLI wages are in effect. For this design services RFP, there will not be a non-resident bidder percentage increase as BOLI wages are not a factor.

Questions #18: Page 9, Section 7, Item 2. b. – are engineering locates required to identify existing underground utilities?

Response: We will provide GIS data for all public utilities. Locating of private utilities is not a requirement for this project.

Question #19: Page 9, Section 7, Item 2. c. – are the costs associated with obtaining construction permits for public right of way encroachment included in this effort?

Response: We would like to see these costs broken out in the final design.

Question #20: Page 9, Section 7, Item 2. f. – is it acceptable for the overall design to be certified by a licensed Electrical Engineer or any other type of engineer licensed in the State of Oregon or other discipline acceptable to the City of Sherwood?

Response: As noted in Section 7,2,(f), "It is preferred but not required that the overall FTTH design is stamped/signed by a Civil Engineer licensed to practice in the State of Oregon. If you are submitting a design that is not stamped by a Civil Engineer that is licensed in the State of Oregon, please include an explination as to why and discuss any impacts on the overall project."

Question #21: Will successful firm be eligible to provide inspection and project management services during the construction effort? Will that be a separate bid?

Response: Yes, It's expected that project management and inspection services will be needed. That will be done through bidding a separate construction management contract at the time of construction.

Question #22: At least one state in which we've previously worked, they required Existing Subsurface Utility Data or Geotechnical Boring. Is anything like this required for this project?

Response: It is anticpated that where perpendicular crossing of "mainline" conduits and existing underground public infrastructure occurs, that vacuum excavation utility locates <u>may</u> be required on a case by case basis, as part of the design process to minimize conflicts and damage. Geotechnical borings for the purpose of determining subsurface soils conditions is not warranted for this project.

Question #23: The RFP indicated that the FTTH design is to be Underground, but the map that is on the website (link is in the RFP) shows a good deal of existing Aerial fiber cable. Just want to confirm: is any of the project expected to be aerial and if so, are we to include pole inventorying, pole load analysis and pole make ready documents in the RFP? If so are there any estimates as to quantity of poles that this will be required for?

Response: Any new construction will need to be built underground. If for backbone and/or distribution purposes the cable can use existing aerial attachements assuming they are approved

Addendum Number 2 Page 3 of 5

for attachment. In those cases all necessary pole information must be obtained and any other data necessary for submitting to Portland General Electric.

Question #24: Due to COVID and the issues with travel/mailing, would an electronic submission only work in this case?

Response: The City is not currently set up to receive proposals through an electronic process. Submittal of proposals will need to comply with the conditions of the issued RFP.

Qestion #25: In reference to the V2 map, could we get estimated footages of the existing infrastructure? 1) Footage of existing fiber (UG vs aerial) 2) Footage of existing conduit without fiber

Response: Estimates of the various lineal footages requested in Items 1) and 2) above are not readily available at this time.

Question #26: Is the existing plant sized for future capacity?

Response: Generally yes but likely not some routes will need to be upsized to account for the residential service.

Question #27: Are there any planned subdivisions that the city has in the future that aren't shown on the map?

Response: The area north of Brookman Road is our current residential growth area. There are subdivisions under land use approval and also currently being built in that area.

Question #28: Are there any sort of SUE (Subsurface Utility Engineering) requirements for the design?

Response: A section detail for perpendicular crossings of "mainline" conduits and existing underground public infrastructure will be required to minimize possible crossing conflicts and damage. Longitudinal profiles of new mainline conduit facilities will not be required.

Question #29: In reference to the 15-point scale for the pricing proposals, how are those 15 points being measured? 1) I see the breakdown of the 85 points for the initial design proposal, but nothing for the price proposal.

Response: The 15-point pricing score is discretionary in its application by the selection committee.

Question #30: We understand the focus is on serving the 6000 LUs in town, but are there any critical government locations that need to be targeted as well? 1) Parks 2) Golf courses 3) Specific buildings 4) Any critical state/city owned properties 5) Our main focus is always working towards future proofing a design, but we want to understand if that is what the town wants or if it's cut and dry -- just target the 6000 homes.

Response: The city already has a very extensive fiber network that serves most city facilities. That being said we'd like the design to account for serving other locations when being passed by the backbone/distribution cable. This can be done by making sure vault, cabinets, and/or splice cases are located in such a way that lends itself to future extensions.

Question #31: What GIS data could we have access to right away to help with the design aspect? 1) Measurements from C/L to existing conduit 2) Location of existing UG fiber in the ROW/PUE

Response: We have included a file geo-database that has our existing conduit and fiber included. These assets are not GPS accurate but depict their general location.

Addendum Number 2 Page 4 of 5

This ADDENDUM shall be signed and attached to the Bidder's Proposal and shall subsequently become part of the Contract Documents.

Company Name	
Proposer Name	
Proposer Signature	
Date	

Addendum Number 2 Page 5 of 5