

ADDENDUM No. 1
RFP-864, General Civil Engineering and Professional
Consulting Services for the City Of Ann Arbor Field Operations Unit
City of Ann Arbor
Due: June 3, 2013

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions shall be made to the Request for Proposal for General Civil Engineering and Professional Consulting Services for the City Of Ann Arbor Field Operations Unit, RFP-864 on which proposals will be received on or before 10:00 am, Monday, June 3, 2013.

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original Request for Proposal and is appended thereto. This Addendum includes 2 pages.

Respondents are to take note in their review of the documents and include these changes as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Questions and Clarifications:

Q: Which consulting companies currently hold or most recently have held this same (or comparable) general services contract with the Field Operations Unit?

A: Stantec and OHM

Q: How many contracts does the City envision will be awarded as a result of this RFP (i.e., how many consultant teams will be contracted)?

A: Up to two (2)

Q: What annual dollar value is envisioned for each of these contracts?

A: Up to \$100,000

Q: Who will be on the City's evaluation/selection team?

A: The evaluation committee has not yet been selected.

Q: Page 5 of the RFP (3rd full paragraph) states "The proposal shall be no more than 40 pages total in length (20 sheets, not including the Contract Compliance and Living Wage Forms), printed in a double-sized format." Is this supposed to read "double-sided" rather than "double-sized"? If it is intended to be "double-sized" could you please provide more details about how we are to format our proposal to satisfy this parameter?

A: This should read "double-sided".

Q: Regarding our fee proposal, since this is an as-needed contract without a defined work scope, how does the City desire that we should present our fee proposal? Simply an hourly rate schedule for various labor categories? Or fees for an assumed hypothetical project? If the City desires us to provide fees for an assumed work scope, we are concerned about whether all consultants will assume a comparable work scope, which could impact evaluation scores for the "Fee Proposal" category.

A: Hourly rates for each labor category are required to be submitted in a separately sealed fee proposal. Proposals are evaluated first on qualifications, secondly on fees. Additionally, fee proposals will not be opened for respondents that do not demonstrate sufficient qualifications.

Q: Regarding the “Proposed Work Plan” section of our proposal, how does the City desire that we should estimate person hours by task and schedule milestones when the work scope is not defined (due to this being an as-needed services contract)?

A: The scope of work is provided as an indication of the variety of tasks we anticipate a respondent would be asked to perform. The purpose of a proposed work plan in this case is to demonstrate to the City your project team’s approach to projects in general.

Q: Regarding item #6 on page 15 of the RFP, since specific projects are not identified, is the intent here that the consultant would present generic information about how we would undertake work for the various work categories listed? Or is a different approach desired?

A: Yes, provide generic information.

Q: Building repairs are mentioned on pages 11 and 15 of the RFP. What types of building repairs are envisioned, and does the City envision the need for the following professionals: architects, mechanical/electrical engineers, building structural engineers?

A: Any aspect of building repair may be requested. Recent building repair projects include roof replacements, HVAC improvements, energy optimization, masonry façade repairs, metal coating replacement, structural concrete, and plumbing upgrades. All professions necessary to complete similar work, and associated fee schedules, should be included with each proposal.