



**COLORADO HIGH PERFORMANCE TRANSPORTATION  
ENTERPRISE**

**ADDENDUM #2 TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL –  
NETWORK BASED REVENUE GENERATING  
OPPORTUNITIES ON CDOT OWNED PROPERTIES**

In accordance with Section 1.5 of the RFP, the HPTE has received the following questions from Respondents and hereby issue the following response to each question.

No.	Proposer Question	HPTE Response
1	<p>What level of participation is CDOT willing to put forth in assisting us in obtaining local permits?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are they willing to attend local government meetings to support our cause?</li> <li>• Are they willing to draft correspondence to support our cause?</li> </ul>	<p>The extent of HPTE’s involvement will be negotiated in any final agreement that may entered into with a selected proposer. Proposers can expect reasonable cooperation from HPTE in obtaining necessary approvals. Any involvement or assistance by CDOT will likely limited to only those consents that are required of an underlying property owner, and will be negotiated separately once more specifics are known as to the transaction structure put forth by a preferred proposer.</p>
2	<p>What information can CDOT provide to assist in developing locations with winning Proposer?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do they have a "list" of potential parcels they are willing to explore for compliance with State and Local regulations? If so, is it broken down in any manner (By district, by county, etc.). The project can be built out much faster if they already have sites identified as candidates for signage as we can sift through these parcels much quicker to determine each parcels legal potential for a sign.</li> <li>• Will CDOT have a liaison for us to work with to help facilitate acquiring information we will need to insure compliance with Federal and State laws, and our State - Federal agreements concerning advertising devices. Such as, information needed to comply with the Bonus law. It would be nice to know if we could contact someone to obtain the needed information vs. going through CORA requests.</li> </ul>	<p>Neither HPTE nor CDOT have identified any proposed sites or undertaken any investigation with respect to properties owned by CDOT that might be suitable for the location of digital communications infrastructure in compliance with state and local regulations. The RFP requests the proposers to undertake this diligence independently.</p> <p>Neither HPTE nor CDOT have identified any specific liaison. HPTE believes the information necessary to respond to the RFP is publicly available. However, if you have further specific information requests, you may submit them to HPTE in accordance with the RFP and HPTE will consider whether and/or how to respond to such request on a case by case basis.</p> <p>HPTE does not expect that CORA requests would be necessary, and would expect to reasonably cooperate with a selected proposer.</p>

3	Sect 2.1, 3rd bullet point: can there be attachments/addendums to RFP above/beyond the 10 pages or is it 10 pages total?	The response to the RFP is ten pages, but Proposers are free to add attachments or agendas beyond that limit. HPTE may elect to evaluate the proposal based on the 10 page limit.
4	Will there be a termination clause for CDOT in the lease/license with winning proposer? If yes, can you provide detail of what circumstances will allow CDOT to be able to terminate and if there will be language protecting investment made by winning proposer in signs, digital screens, etc.	HPTE and CDOT have not yet discussed the specific terms of a potential lease structure. Such terms are anticipated to be negotiated as part of the execution of any final agreement that may be entered into with a selected proposer. Proposers are encouraged to offer suggested structures, identify their expectations/assumptions with regard to a lease/license term and termination provisions, and explain how such expectations/assumptions could affect the revenue-generating potential of their proposal.
5	Do outside consultants used for various zoning research and problem solving need to all be listed in the proposal if they are not employees of company proposing?	HPTE prefers to see all entities that will be assisting the Proposer in their work if they are successful. These entities would be subs to the Contractor, and would have to be added to the contract.
6	Can you provide the names of the companies/individuals that responded to the RFI?	<p>HPTE received responses to the RFI from the following entities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SWC Group</li> <li>2. Wattsup LED</li> <li>3. Phillips</li> <li>4. Long Engineering</li> <li>5. Diamond Communications</li> <li>6. Branded Cities Network, LLC</li> <li>7. HDR</li> <li>8. Roane Inventions Inc.</li> </ol>