

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 23-16

PUBLIC WORKS / SYSTEMS PLANNING GENERAL ENGINEERING SERVICES

Due: March 30th, 2023, at 2:00 P.M. (local time)

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any) and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes THREE (3) pages.**

The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:

- **Attachment B - Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment C - Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form**

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.

I. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Changes to the RFP documents which are outlined below are referenced to a page or Section in which they appear conspicuously. Offerors are to take note in its review of the documents and include these changes as they may affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Section/Page(s)

Change

Page 9

Remove:

The term of the contracts will be through June 30, 2026 with an optional extension for up to two (2) additional years. It shall be understood that the submitted hourly rates are to be honored over the term of the contract. If the contract is extended, a onetime cost escalator of no more than 3% may be added to the submitted rates. A written request from the Contractor at the end original contract period from will be required to consider any rate adjustments.

Replace with:

The term of the contracts will be through June 30, 2026 with an optional extension for up to two (2) additional years. It shall be understood that the submitted hourly rates are to be honored over the term of the contract with an annual cost escalator of 2.5% for all three years. If the contract is extended, the same 2.5% escalator will be applied.

II. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: If the proposer does not provide all of the services listed in the scope of work, should/could the proposer identify team partners/subconsultants to fulfill all of the required scope of work items listed (e.g. surveying, architecture, landscape architecture) or is the City look for a firm to provide all the requested scope of services?

Answer 1: The Proposer shall provide a list of all proposed partners/subconsultants necessary to fulfill the scope of work requirements in this RFP if the firm cannot offer all required services by itself.

Question 2: Are we limited to 8.5x11 page sizes or can we use 11x17?

Answer 2: 11x17 page sizes are acceptable.

Question 3: Are project profiles included in the page limit?

Answer 3: Project profiles are included in the page limit.

Question 4: Will the City consider an alternative arrangement for fee escalation? Given the current economic situation, maintaining rates over 3-5 years is difficult and the single 3% escalation associated with the contract extension will be tough for consultants to accommodate. A couple alternatives to consider are allowing consultants to submit yearly rates or an escalation amount per year.

Answer 4: Please see above section: I. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Question 5: Does the City plan to utilize both an on-site engineer for Public Works and for Systems Planning? Can you provide an approximation of how much has been spent for "on-site engineering" within each of these Service Units in either FY22 or FY23?

Answer 5: No – At this time, it is undetermined what needs may arise for an on-site engineer.

In FY22 and FY23, no on-site engineer had a dedicated physical workspace at any City facility.

Question 6: Can you provide an estimate of the minimum amount time anticipated that the onsite engineer(s) would be asked to work from City facilities (rather than remotely)?

Answer 6: At this time, it is undetermined what needs may arise for an on-site engineer.

Question 7: Are there any upcoming CIP projects for which the City plans to utilize firms contracted under this RFP?

Answer 7: Yes, the following projects are potentially anticipated to utilize firms contracted under this RFP:

- UT-ST-20-05 - Detention Basin Restoration/Reconstruction
- UT-ST-24-S3 - Pinecrest/Darrow Crosslot Storm Main Rerouting Study
- UT-ST-24-11 - Liberty Detention Retrofit/Restoration
- UT-ST-24-06 - Newport Creek Address Pinch Points at MDOT rail crossing
- UT-SN-24-S1 - Swift Run Sanitary Sewer Capacity Analysis
- UT-WS-24-S1 - Steere Farm Raw Water Main Alignment Study

Please note that these are a sample of anticipated projects and that the previous list is not final nor exhaustive.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.