

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 17-14

Engineering Consulting Services

Due: Thursday, July 6, 2017 at 2:00 P.M. (local time)

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions shall be made to the Request for Proposals for Engineering Consulting Services, RFP No. 17-14, on which proposals will be received on/or before Thursday, July 6, 2017 at 2:00 P.M.

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any), and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes four (4) pages.**

Offeror 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 will be considered nonconforming.

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

- City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Ordinance Declaration of Compliance
- City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Ordinance Declaration of Compliance
- Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form

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

I.CHANGES AND CLARIFICATIONS

1. On page four (4) under F. Sealed Proposal Submission, all proposals must be **delivered to the City Customer Service Unit**, NOT the Procurement Unit. The Customer Service unit is located on the first floor of City Hall at the following address:

City of Ann Arbor
C/O Customer Service
301 East Huron Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

2. Also under Section 1: General Information, F. Sealed Proposal Submission, each respondent must **submit a total of three (3) hard copy proposals** in a sealed envelope, not four (4). This should include:

- One (1) original proposal
- Two (2) additional proposal copies
- One (1) digital copy of the proposal, preferably on a flash drive as one file in PDF format.

*Note that the two (2) hard copies of the fee proposals shall be delivered in a separate sealed envelope.

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 a firm does not have the full scope of services in-house, would the City of Ann Arbor be open to hiring a firm that is not full service? Could the firm partner with consultants?

Answer 1: Yes, the City will consider firms without a full scope of services in-house but those firms should include a list of firms that they partner with regularly. However, the evaluation will be based on the qualifications of the prime consultant.

Question 2: On page 14, Under Section C. Proposed Work Plan, Paragraph 2, the first sentence seems to be missing additional text after “whereby problems developed as the project.”

Answer 2: The text should read “whereby problems developed as the project **progressed.**”

Question 3: Is it anticipated that the architectural consultants and engineering consultants will work together or separately?

Answer 3: The architectural consultants are intended to be the prime consultants for work on buildings that includes any design considerations. Architects would most likely use their preferred sub-consultant, but may choose to partner with one of the standing engineering consultants. Engineers could be the only consultant on building projects that do not include a design component.

Question 4: On page 16 under Preparation of Proposals it specifies that proposals should have no plastic bindings. What sort of bindings may be accepted?

Answer 4: One of the three (3) hard copies of the proposal can have a plastic binding. The other two copies should simply be stapled or use binder clips.

Question 5: Would winning one of the two standing contracts for engineering or architectural services preclude a firm from winning the other contract?

Answer 5: No, each firm will be considered separately for each RFP.

Question 6: Will there be a separate RFP for Landscape Architectural services?

Answer 6: No, there is not a separate RFP for Landscape Architectural services but it can be included under the engineering consulting services RFP.

Question 7: Would the City be interested in additional consultants such as environmental services that could perform tasks such as wetland delineation, etc.?

Answer 7: Yes the city is interested in any relevant expertise including environmental services, surveying, etc.

Question 8: If a firm has multiple disciplines in-house, would the City still want one person to act as the point of contact?

Answer 8: Yes, the city would like one point of contact for the contract, while we understand that there may be additional points of contact depending on the project.

Question 9: Is there potential to extend the contract after three (3) years?

Answer 9: It is possible to extend the contract if the consultant is engaged in a project that will continue beyond the end of the contract. Otherwise, the consultant must

reapply for the next standing contract. There is also potential to extend the contract beyond the \$150,000 per fiscal year limit with City Council approval.

Question 10: The RFP lists structural repairs to bridges as an example of a service to be provided. What type of bridge projects are anticipated?

Answer 10: The Gallup vehicle bridge is in need of a structural assessment to determine capacity. Additionally, there are boardwalks located at Gallup's canoe livery and Riverside Park that are in need of repair.

Question 11: How much work is anticipated for each of the two potential engineering consulting firms?

Answer 11: The selected firms will submit proposals unique to each project and be selected based on their past experience and unique expertise. At this point, the schedule of upcoming projects has not yet been defined, however, the existing standing contract had approximately 8 projects ranging from a small barrier free accessible boat dock to over a mile of non-motorized trail design. Total consulting fees were approximately \$350,000 over the three years.

Question 12: Will the sign-in sheet for the pre-proposal meeting be made available?

Answer 12: Yes, it is included in this Addendum.

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

RFP #17-14
Request For Proposal of Engineering Consulting Services
Pre-Proposal Meeting Sign In Sheet
Monday, June 26, 2017

Name	Company	Phone Number	Email Address
Hillary Hanzel	City of Ann Arbor	734-794-6230x42548	hhanzel@a2gov.org
Amy Kuras	City of Ann Arbor	734-794-6230x42590	akuras@a2gov.org
CHUCK McKALE	DICLEMENTE SIEBEL	248-569-1430	cmckale@dsonline.com
DAVE SCHULTZ	ROWE PSC	810.341.7500	dschultz@rowepsc.com
Joe Siwek	Tetra Tech	734-213-4052	joe.siwek@tetratech.com
MICHAEL SPRINGER	NORTHWEST CONSULTANTS	419-705-3225	mspringer@nec-ox.com
MARK MATTSON	DLZ	313 961 4040	mmattson@dlz.com
JAMES ENSIGN	BERGMANN ASSOCIATES	989-493-0997	jensign@bergmannpc.com
Ann Stevens	Stantec	734.214.1863	ann.stevens@stantec.com
Gwen Hubbard	stantec		gwen.hubbard@stantec.com gwen.hubbard@stantec.com
Prat Nagu	CTC Engineering	906.231.5697	pnagu@ctcengineer.com
jamie govenflo	Midwestern Consulting	734 975 0200	jg@midwesternconsulting.com
Sue Dickinson	Midwestern Consulting	734-904-2665	scd@midwesternconsulting.com
OMKAR JAGDALE	Beckett & Raeder	203-506-5658	ojagdale@Bria2.com
Manisa Laderach	Beckett & Raeder	734-239-6615	MLADERACH@BRIA2.COM
Rob Behnke	Fleis & Vandenbriuk	269-788-4747	rbehnke@fveng.com