

DRAFT

**Boulder Valley School District
Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)
June 27, 2007
4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.**

Committee members present: Phil Bisant, Jerry Janssen, Kevin Manweiler, Marla Meehl, Mike Monticello, Chris Puccio, Joe Thielen, Jim VanDyke, Dave Williamson, David Wood

Other BVSD personnel and Bond Oversight Committee members present: Susan Cousins, Kevin Cubillas, Lee Farhar, Doug Healy, Brittany Keller, Joe McBreen, Sharon Meyer, Don Orr, Elisabeth Patterson, Jim Reed, Alan Schoenfeld

Community members present: Dan Lubar, employees of the City of Boulder

Chairman Chris Puccio opened the meeting with an overview of the work the ITAC committee has completed and the progress to date, including reviewing and selecting build options and looking into existing conduit and fiber for the sharing of assets, in order to set the stage for the drafting of the RFP for engineering.

WAN Consultant Kevin Manweiler reviewed the progress of the committee; the tasks assigned, and the decisions made at past meetings, in a short PowerPoint presentation.

- Engineering RFP to be developed with two options:
 - Engineering and permitting all new construction for the build of fiber WAN
 - Engineering and permitting all new construction for the build of a fiber WAN less existing infrastructure/shared assets
- Identify existing infrastructure
- ITAC sub-committee tasked with surveying existing infrastructure

The task of the committee at this meeting is review the draft RFP written by Mr. Manweiler, as well as the completed attachments.

In surveying the existing infrastructure, Mr. Manweiler and the City of Boulder's IT department reviewed existing documentation on available infrastructure and surveyed all existing duct-banks and empty conduits. All hand holes and traffic manholes were inspected and documented for access and empty conduits.

The survey identified 54,000 linear feet of spare conduit and most duct banks has 3-5 spare conduits. The City of Boulder and the District are working toward an agreement to share on conduit.

Using the results of the survey and the informal agreement with the City of Boulder to share assets/existing conduits, a construction route design was drafted. Also taken into consideration for the new design is the willingness of Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) to lift the right of way restriction on Highway 36 and the agreement with the City of Boulder to share the costs associated with the engineering and construction of a fiber WAN build on Jay Road.

Building on Highway 36 requires a restricted use permit that runs from \$250,000 to \$500,000 to purchase, however CDOT is looking into lifting that restriction for the school district. The City is already in progress on the fiber build on Jay Road. They will negotiate a price split with the school district.

The new design includes the following linear feet for each ring; backbone and laterals:

- West Ring Backbone, 82,584 linear feet
- West Ring Laterals, 48,926 linear feet
- East Ring Backbone, 136,234 linear feet
- East Ring Laterals, 58,473 linear feet
- **Total New Construction, 326,218 linear feet**

The west ring will include 168 count fiber and the east ring will include 144 count fiber. The west ring design fills in most of the city's and other government agencies' gaps.

Due to the above finds, the draft RFP was reduced to one option. There is no longer a need for the complete fiber build option when there is already 59,000 feet existing conduit that is available for sharing and use.

Mr. Manweiler clarified that this build would be within the allotted WAN budget.

The following items were discussed by the committee:

- Will the evaluation criteria be listed in the RFP? Yes, as an attachment/separate pages to the RFP.
- The draft RFP is just for the engineering of the fiber WAN, not for the construction. An engineering firm is needed to give the district a figure to engineer the build and handle permitting.
- Engineering and construction will occur in defined segments.
- The engineering firm will have a running line, define segments, and identify existing utilities. They will provide the drawing package that the construction company will use.
- Any necessary changes that must be made to the original drawing will be made by the engineering company before construction is complete on that particular segment.
- The construction firm will be responsible for obtaining dig permits.
- The City of Boulder has already begun the process of drafting intergovernmental agreements for the sharing of assets. The City will offer the School District conduit in exchange for strands of fiber. Chris Puccio would like to frame the IGA so that it is flexible. That was when things change only its attachments will need to be adjusted.
- Maintenance of the WAN will need to be further discussed or researched. Who will handle locates and maintenance costs? Entities sharing the fiber can pay an annual fee to help offset these costs. Sub-contractors can also provide locate services.
- Who would you contact if there was a break in the line? The construction firm is responsible for locates and breaks until BVSD takes possession of it. A sub contractor should be hired (through the bid process) and chosen before the completion of construction and the possession of the lines. The district can contract with that sub contractor to provide 24-hour and emergency service with a 1-hour response time.
- Maintenance and break fixes have already been calculated in the financial analysis.

Look at lease agreement if companies want to use some of the fiber – to generate revenue and offset costs, but really need to be responsible for the maintenance. May even want to market it a bit – entities would be very interested in this. When do you market it? Is now the time? Is sooner better than later? Keep the momentum up and trying to pull in other entities at this point will just slow down the process with legal departments and agreements. Chris would recommend to keep going.

Boulder Research Administrative Network – CU, NCAR, UCAR are all members of that – makes BRAN project more affordable – empty conduit will be shared. Small jobs to connect to existing fiber is almost double. We do plan to make one more round of contacts with them before we are done.

Will work with purchasing on criteria – price is important, but past performance is crucial to this. The drawings are also very important – need correct maps with utilities. Terms and conditions – will have to follow. Look at financials – are they big enough to handle a job like this. We want to see resumes – the employees, what they make, documentation control, quality control,.

What if a drawing is incorrect? Who is responsible? They are responsible for the accuracy of the drawings however they are not finite – they may need to get around a utility.

Design, engineering, electronics, construction, and management is included in the whole plan. 10 percent contingency. If the construction firm hits a glitch and needs to change something, the engineering firm will need to redo the drawings. Pay in segments. There is some recourse for this – they will have to redo the drawings before payment. They don't get paid until completed.

Pricing matrix shows by segment and by task. Only concern with the estimates are on North Broadway – will be doing some re-pavement in the future – also rock concerns.

Don't break out the east and west ring for the RFP and bid packages – no, want to keep consistency. 2 engineering firms in the State who can handle this and several smaller firms outside the state. They need to match – it is like building a bridge. You can have more than one construction firm because they are all following the same drawings.

Publish on the website – to advertise. There may be 5-7 very competitive engineering companies.

Offer incentive to find shorter routes if possible, but maps show the shortest we currently know of.

Goal for today is to have the committee to approve of the DRAFT so we can proceed from here. Do we need another meeting before we send this out – before there is a final?

IS the engineering firm responsible for inside plant work, except for in one facility. District will build outside secure facilities for this. Stainless steel vault. RFP is for engineering only and permitting approval.

Will engineering firm plan all the splice points? They are not included at this point because we do not yet know the equipment being purchased. We still have some clean up to be done. The drawings need to be approved at the engineering level. It is conceivable that we could draw something that cannot be built that is why they need to be approved by the city – they will identify any potential problems and construction. Putting out in segments so timeline can shorten. Kevin still working on the segments part. We can then tentatively schedule the bid package. We need to approve of the DRAFT so that we can move forward with the segments and finishing up the documents.

Committee in agreement with the general approach. Timeline to wrap up the rest of this? Maps and description of work will be cleaned up. Electronically send out a soft copy of the RFP to the committee and get back to us in a reasonable timeline.

2-3 weeks Kevin will send out a final version and one week for comments and feedback – everyone in favor. Evaluation committee – anyone interested? Chris will ask for membership via email.

Auto CAD 2004 – standard software.

There is a set of best practices that they will need to follow. Good idea to interview that bidders. Document control will be completed – has to be detailed – what is there communication – web based interface where you can see their schedule. We need to ask them to provide these things, not just expect them to provide it. The DRAFT is not word for word but you will see it on the final document. Ask them to follow a particular format. This group is closed and moves onto the evaluation committee.

Thanks to everyone!