

## Addendum # 2 to NOFA #002

Pursuant to Section 1.9 of the NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY #002 (“NOFA”): “The Office reserves the right to amend this NOFA at any time. In the event the Office decides to amend, add to, or delete any part of this NOFA, a written amendment will be attached to the NOFA as an addendum, and posted at <https://ocio.iowa.gov/broadband>.” The following amends NOFA #002:

### Amendment #2:

1. Section 3.1.4 (Completeness) of the NOFA describes the “Completeness” factor for purposes of the quantitative scoring as follows:

3.1.4. *Completeness* (Iowa Code § 8B.11(4)(a)(5)). This factor operates on the premise that Projects that make 25/3 Broadband available to a higher proportion of Broadband Units within the Targeted Service Areas forming the basis of a Project further the objectives of the Program.

**Formula:** The aggregate number of Broadband Units within the Targeted Service Areas forming the basis of the Project **divided by** ( $\div$ ) the total Broadband Units Applicant represents will be Facilitated with 25/3 Broadband upon the completion of the Project.

This results in a “completeness” measure. The **higher** the measure, the more complete the Project. The resulting measures of all applicants will be compared against each other to calculate the Completeness score for each individual Applicant.

(Highlight added for emphasis). In preparing to conduct the quantitative scoring process, the Office determined the NOFA incorrectly stated that a “higher” measure is better as a result of a clerical error. Consistent with the purpose statement—“This factor operates on the premise that Projects that make 25/3 Broadband available to a higher proportion of Broadband Units within the Targeted Service Areas forming the basis of a Project further the objectives of the Program”—a “lower” measure is in fact better.

As a result, Section 3.1.4 (Completeness) of the NOFA is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

3.1.4. *Completeness* (Iowa Code § 8B.11(4)(a)(5)). This factor operates on the premise that Projects that make 25/3 Broadband available to a higher proportion of Broadband Units within the Targeted Service Areas forming the basis of a Project further the objectives of the Program.

**Formula:** The aggregate number of Broadband Units within the Targeted Service Areas forming the basis of the Project **divided by**

(÷) the total Broadband Units Applicant represents will be Facilitated with 25/3 Broadband upon the completion of the Project.

This results in a “completeness” measure. The lower the measure, the more complete the Project. The resulting measures of all applicants will be compared against each other to calculate the Completeness score for each individual Applicant.

2. Section 3.1.5 (Relative Speed) of the NOFA, defining and outlining how the Office will consider the Relative Speed factor as part of the Quantitative Factors the Office will consider in deciding whether, to which Projects, and in what amount(s) to make an Award(s), provides in relevant part:

3.1.5. *Relative Speed* (Iowa Code § 8B.11(4)(a)(3)). This factor operates on the premise that Projects that Facilitate higher upload/download speeds further the objectives of the Program.

**Formula:** The average upload/download speeds in terms of megabits per second that the Applicant represents will be Facilitated to all Targeted Service Areas forming the basis of the Project.

The resulting averages of all Applicants will be compared against each other to calculate the Relative Speed score for each individual Applicant.

In finalizing internal documentation to be utilized by the Office in scoring Grant Applications, the Office observed that the Project Worksheet (Exhibit B in the Core Application Excel Workbook) requests speed information on a Census-Block basis within a series of predefined ranges (e.g., upload/download speeds from 25-34.99 megabits per second, 35-49.99 megabits per second, etc ...).

As a result, the Office hereby amends Section 3.1.5 (Relative Speed) to be clear that in calculating the “average upload/download speed” for purposes of determining Relative Speed scores, the Office will use the top end of the range selected by Applicants. For example, if an Applicant represents that they will Facilitate service between 25-34.99 megabits per second to a given Targeted Service Area, the Office will consider the Applicant to have represented that they will Facilitate 34.99 megabits per second to that Targeted Service Area for purposes of calculating their Relative Speed score.

3. Section 3.1.7 (Geographic Diversity) of the NOFA describes the “Geographic Diversity” factor for purposes of the quantitative scoring as follows:

3.1.7. *Geographic Diversity* (Iowa Code § 8B.11(4)(a)(6)). This factor operates on the premise that the State has an interest in ensuring that Projects are reasonably spread out across the entire State.

**Formula:**

3.1.7.1. Baseline: Projects will first be mapped to their respective congressional districts. If a Project is located in one or more congressional districts, the Project will be deemed to be located in the congressional district in which the

highest number of Targeted Services Areas forming the basis of the Project are located. From there, the total number of points available within this category will be **divided by** ( $\div$ ) the total number of projects proposed within that congressional district. Each applicant within a respective congressional district will receive the number of points that result from that calculation.

- 3.1.7.2. Downward Adjustment: After the Baseline score is calculated, Projects that directly overlap more than a *de minimis* amount with one or more other Projects will receive a downward adjustment of 10% of the total number of points available within this category. A *de minimis* overlap means five percent (5%) or **more** of the Targeted Service Areas forming the basis of one or more proposed Projects are the same, excluding Targeted Service Areas that overlap on the boundaries of any overlapping Projects. Projects cannot receive a score of less than zero (0) in this category.

(Highlights added for emphasis). In preparing to conduct the quantitative scoring process, the Office has determined the NOFA incorrectly stated that a *de minimis* overlap means an overlap of five percent (5%) or “more.” In fact, a *de minimis* overlap means an overlap of five percent (5%) or “less.” Consistent with the purpose statement—“This factor operates on the premise that the State has an interest in ensuring that Projects are reasonably spread out across the entire State”—the rationale underlying the Downward Adjustment is that Projects that substantially overlap with other proposed Projects are less spread out across the State, whereas Projects that only overlap with other proposed Projects a *de minimis* amount are more spread out.

As a result, Section 3.1.7 (Geographic Diversity) of the NOFA is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

- 3.1.7. *Geographic Diversity* (Iowa Code § 8B.11(4)(a)(6)). This factor operates on the premise that the State has an interest in ensuring that Projects are reasonably spread out across the entire State.

**Formula:**

- 3.1.7.1. Baseline: Projects will first be mapped to their respective congressional districts. If a Project is located in one or more congressional districts, the Project will be deemed to be located in the congressional district in which the highest number of Targeted Services Areas forming the basis of the Project are located. From there, the total number of points available within this category will be **divided by** ( $\div$ ) the total number of Projects proposed

within that congressional district. Each Applicant within a respective congressional district will initially receive the number of points that result from that calculation, subject to the Downward Adjustment set forth in Section 3.1.7.2 (Downward Adjustment), below.

- 3.1.7.2. Downward Adjustment: After the Baseline score is calculated, Projects that directly overlap more than a *de minimis* amount with one or more other Projects will receive a downward adjustment of 10% of the total number of points available within this category. A *de minimis* overlap means five percent (5%) or less of the Targeted Service Areas forming the basis of one or more proposed Projects are the same, excluding Targeted Service Areas that overlap on the boundaries of any overlapping Projects. Projects cannot receive a score of less than zero (0) in this category.

The foregoing amendments do not substantively alter the way OCIO intended to conduct scoring. Further, OCIO does not believe the foregoing amendments should have any impact on whether Applicants choose to submit an Application or how Applicant's complete or frame their Applications because the purpose statements associated with each amended Quantitative Factor clearly communicated the rationale underlying each factor, respectively. However, Applicants are encouraged to make sure they understand the substance of the changes contained in this Amendment and remain solely responsible for updating their Applications in light of or in response to this Amendment, as necessary, prior to submission. If you have already submitted your Application and believe this Amendment affects your Application, please let the Office know and we will allow you to amend your Application in response to this Amendment prior to the submission deadline.